

296 L68r

Lewisohn \$3.50
Rebirth, a book
of modern Jewish
thought

296 L68r

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERKOWITZ PHOTO CO., K. C., MO.

REBIRTH

A BOOK OF MODERN JEWISH THOUGHT

SELECTED AND EDITED
BY
LUDWIG LEWISOHN



PUBLISHERS
Harper & Brothers
NEW YORK 1935 LONDON

REBIRTH: A BOOK OF MODERN JEWISH THOUGHT

*Copyright, 1935, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America*

*All rights in this book are reserved.
No part of the book may be reproduced in any
manner whatsoever without written permis-
sion. For information address
Harper & Brothers*

FIRST EDITION

I-K

TO MY SON
AND HIS MOTHER

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I AM deeply indebted to the Jüdischer Verlag of Berlin and to its managing director, Dr. Siegmund Katznelson, for permission to excerpt, translate, and print the extracts from the works of Theodor Herzl, Achad Ha'Am, A. D. Gordon, Jacob Klatzkin, F. Bernstein, Theodor Lessing and the editorial from the *Jüdische Rundschau*, which has since appeared in a volume published by the Jüdischer Verlag under the title *Ja-sagen zum Judentum*.

For permission to print all the other material in this volume (except such as is in the public domain) I am indebted to the great kindness and generosity of the authors: Dr. Martin Buber (Heppenheim a. d. Bergstrasse), Dr. Hans Kohn (Smith College), Dr. Hugo Bergmann (Jerusalem), Arnold Zweig (Jerusalem), Dr. Max Brod (Prah), Maxime Piha (Paris), to whose friendly services I also owe a French version of the fragments of Alfonso Pacifici; Professor Albert Einstein (Princeton University), Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis (Washington), Dr. Stephen S. Wise (New York), Louis Lipsky (New York), Professor Mordecai M. Kaplan (Jewish Theological Seminary of America), Professor Shalom Spiegel (The Jewish Institute of Religion) and Maurice Samuel (New York and Tel Aviv).

I owe fruitful suggestions and bibliographical material to my friend Saul S. Spiro of Burlington, Vermont.

L. L.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	xiii
INTRODUCTION	xvii
<i>MOSES HESS</i>	
I. A Living People	3
II. Vain Flight	3
III. The Folk in the East	5
IV. The Jewish Religion	6
V. Light from the Past	7
VI. Judaism and Humanity	7
VII. The Last Word	9
<i>LEON PINSKER</i>	
From Autoemancipation	13
<i>THEODOR HERZL</i>	
I. The Jewish Question	24
II. Things as They Are	26
III. Modern Anti-Semitism	27
IV. The State	29
V. Fragments from the Diaries	30
<i>MAX NORDAU</i>	
The Modern Crises in Jewish History	34
<i>BERNARD LAZARE</i>	
Notes on a Conversion	47
<i>ACHAD HA'AM</i>	
I. Outer Freedom and Inner Servitude	55
II. A Crumb of Comfort	56
III. National Ethics	63
<i>AARON DAVID GORDON</i>	
I. Work and Culture	73
II. On Rebirth in the Dispersion	77

MARTIN BUBER

I. The Meaning	90
II. Of Oneness	95
III. Ultimate Aims	98
IV. The True Foundation	100
V. The Central Myth	103
VI. The Only Way	104
VII. The Primal Powers	107

ALFONSO PACIFICI

I. Uniqueness	111
II. Power	111
III. Rebirth	114

HANS KOHN

The People of the Yoke	118
------------------------	-----

HUGO BERGMANN

I. True Autonomy	130
II. The Sanctification of the Name	135
III. Pesach and the People of This Time	143

ARNOLD ZWEIG

I. Ultimate Causes	150
II. And the Jews?	154
III. The Inner Tragedy	158
IV. Rebirth	162

JACOB KLATZKIN

The Heroic Life	168
-----------------	-----

FRITZ BERNSTEIN

I. The Sources of Human Hostility	174
II. Racial Anti-Semitism	177
III. Last Words	180

THEODOR LESSING

The Western Jew	185
-----------------	-----

<i>MAX BROD</i>	
I. Jewish Naïveté	193
II. The Great Transition in a Jewish Life	196
<i>ALBERT EINSTEIN</i>	
Assimilation and Nationalism	203
<i>MAXIME PIHA</i>	
Of Youth Returning	215
<i>LOUIS D. BRANDEIS</i>	
I. Democracy and Nationality	223
II. Nations and Nationalities	225
III. Zionism	228
IV. Zionism and Patriotism	232
<i>STEPHEN S. WISE</i>	
Rededication	236
<i>LOUIS LIPSKY</i>	
There Is Singing on Mount Scopus!	247
<i>MORDECAI M. KAPLAN</i>	
Judaism as a Civilization	254
<i>LUDWIG LEWISOHN</i>	
I. Disassociation	275
II. Ways of Life	282
III. Crisis	287
IV. To Youth	296
<i>SHALOM SPIEGEL</i>	
The Curse of a Lie	302
<i>MAURICE SAMUEL</i>	
I. Jewry and the World Mob	316
II. Lights in Darkness	323
III. The Secret	329
<i>EDITORS OF THE "JEWISH REVIEW"</i>	
Wear It with Pride—the Yellow Badge!	336

PREFACE

FOR nearly a decade now the insistent question has been addressed to me by both Jews and Gentiles: Where in the English language are we to obtain knowledge of Jewry and of Judaism and what are we to study and what are we to point out to others? The questioners were not always equipped with even a minimum of knowledge or of true zeal for it. A good deal of sound Jewish lore and learning has for a long time existed in English. But it must be freely admitted that many of the books in question were not very accessible either in their form or in the form of their publication.¹ I seemed to see, at all events, exactly what the questioners meant, and at length, after many delays, I offer them this book as perhaps the most sorely needed one in an age of crisis both for the Jewish people and for all mankind.

What is this book? It is not another collection of passages chosen for either their mere literary or their mere philosophical value, although many have high value of both kinds. Its purport is one and its drive is straight. It consists of the best that the keenest and most devoted Jewish minds have for a period of over seventy years thought and expressed on the subject of Israel and its fate. Many of the authors represented in this book have written widely on non-Jewish subjects or on peripheral Jewish subjects. Such matter is excluded. The book as it stands is *their* answer to the question, What shall Israel do to be saved?

¹ A brilliant exception was E. Fleg's *Jewish Anthology*, edited and translated by Maurice Samuel. And quite recently two books of the highest merit in their fields have been published—*Judaism as a Civilization*, by Mordecai M. Kaplan, and *The Hasidic Anthology*, by Louis I. Newman.

The answer—though couched in such different terms and reached by so many various roads of thought and of experience over so long a period of time—the answer is one. There are Russian Jews in this book and there are Jews from Austria and Germany and Czechoslovakia and there are Jews from two of the Latin civilizations; there is a Dutch Jew and there is a group of American Jews. And all these men, except the writers of Hebrew (Achad Ha'Am and A. D. Gordon and J. Klatzkin), wrote not only in the outer but also in the inner idiom of their adopted Western countries and show unmistakably the German and the French and the American influences they have so profoundly undergone. Yet all of them, using the methods more or less dictated to them by their Western culture, started from the same facts, both the inner facts and the outer facts, and came to the same conclusions, both negative and positive. Take the fragments that I have selected and translated from Bernard Lazare's *Le Fumier de Job*. Lazare, who was born in Nîmes (where his medallion portrait set in a wall of the lovely garden of the Roman baths has had its nose knocked off by hoodlums)—Lazare considered himself to be and felt himself to be a Latin, a Frenchman of the South. Then came the accusation and the trial and the condemnation of Dreyfus, and Lazare turned in upon himself and found the substance of his Jewish soul and without much help or instruction from anyone (his closest friend to his untimely end continuing to be the Catholic mystic and stylist, Charles Péguy), found all the laws and the monitions of that soul written within him, as it were, on palimpsest. The acid of history rendered the writing clear and the fragments I cite are almost a symbolic concentration or quintessence of all that others, his superiors in Jewish and in Western learning, in experience and in stringency of thought, have contributed to these pages. In brief, this book has coherence and unity, as the old rhetorics used to say, because the fate and mind of Israel have coherence and unity. There is but one sound

interpretation of the history of Jewry since the so-called emancipation and there is but one way for Israel to pursue from now on, and both the interpretation and the way are contained in this book.

Such is its message and its meaning for Jews. It has also a message and a meaning for the Gentile world. There is much talk abroad of the Jews hanging together; there are foul and stupid myths of a Jewish world conspiracy and the clumsy forgery known as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion is no doubt still enflaming morons on the barbarous edges of civilization. Well, the facts are that in this bitter age the Jewish people, like every other people, is bitterly and tragically divided. We have our stubborn capitalists and our equally stiff-necked radicals; we have our orthodox and our so-called rationalists; we still have, alas! though in decreasing numbers, our assimilationists, our millions of poor souls who will not read the manifest lesson of history and who by their dead weight and Jewish inactivity render so heart-breakingly difficult the necessary rebirth of the Jewish people. But there is a group of men, representing a growing group of Jews, who are passionately concerned that the Jewish people shall put aside its differences and its divisions and be one and at one for the purpose of its salvation as a people. And it is this group of men who speak in the pages of this book. They are the only Elders of Zion who exist and their plan for unifying and saving the Jewish people constitutes the only Jewish world conspiracy that exists. And so this book has its message to all well-disposed Gentiles, to all Christian men and women who, having read it, may agree that the cognitions and the hopes and the plans expressed by so many men in this book are the cognitions and the plans that may best heal the Gentile world of *its* disease of anti-Semitism and may most effectively normalize the position of the Jews and their relations to their fellow-people.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

INTRODUCTION

I

THE Jewish problem exists. Strange words to be set down on this day and in this year. But there are still two groups of people, each a diminishing one, that desire sincerely to remain unaware of the existence of the problem: a group of Jews in the Western countries who, having achieved, at whatever cost, a reasonable adjustment and equilibrium, shrink from crisis and decision, and a group of liberal Gentiles, commonly outspoken philo-Semites, who resolutely turn their faces from the black and cruel shame that stains their civilization. The arguments advanced by both of these groups are very much alike: the Jews are not a race; the Jews are not a people; the Jews are a religious community, but since religion is a dying force in the modern world, the Jews are rapidly ceasing to be that, too. In brief, the Jews are disappearing, and as they are disappearing the world-old problem is being solved.

This quaint argument that the burning Jewish problem exists and sears the very heart of mankind because there are no such people as Jews, could in some specious and superficial way be defended so long as it seemed or could be made to seem, that the persecution of the Jews was most violent in those countries, like Tsarist Russia or contemporary Poland and Rumania, in which the Jews had clung most loyally to their faith, their folkways, and their communal structures. The proponents of this argument had, of course, to eliminate from both observation and memory the period of Stöcker and Dühring in Germany, the period of Drumont and Dreyfus in France; they had to feign,

at least to themselves, not to see the signs of a growing resistance in recent years to the Jewish people precisely in those countries in which their own ideal, namely, the gradual *apparent* elimination of the Jews, seemed approaching a superficial realization. Incredible as it must seem to any responsible thinker or observer, there are still Jews in the world who, though with lurking terror and despair, there are still old-guard Gentile liberals who, though ever more furtively and disingenuously, unite in asserting that the German anti-Jewish terror of 1933, deliberately and consciously directed against the most de-Judaized, against the most highly Westernized group of Jews in history, burst forth with its foul flame of slander and torture, of blood and tears, because—there are no Jews. Thus in the month of May, 1933, an American Jew of high intellectual distinction wrote and an American liberal weekly printed without comment these words: "In so far as the Jews have succeeded in this process of adjustment, they have prospered; in so far as they have pursued the policy of self-segregation, they have laid themselves open to the hostility which the alien always incurs." And neither the Jewish writer of these words nor the Gentile editors of the paper saw, first, that the German terror was the historic and ultimate disproof of their shabby thesis, and that, secondly, they were utterly betraying their own liberalism by admitting as a valid human motive that hatred of recognizable difference from any dominant group which lends its tragic flavour to the words *alien*, *foreigner*, *Fremder*, *étranger*, *strangero*. They denied the stern facts of the German terror and its sterner and ultimate teachings, and at the same time allied themselves with it. . . . Poor, terror-stricken souls, hurrying from confusion to confusion, self-deceived, vaguely Utopian, destined to be crushed in the iron mill of the historic process.

The Jewish problem exists. It has existed ever since any considerable group of the Jewish people were driven from their land and exiled among the nations. It existed in

Alexandria and Rome; it exists today wherever Jews dwell; it changes its outer forms as the Gentiles change their rationalizations; its central character does not vary from age to age. And yet that part of the historic process which is called the Jewish problem will be seen not to have been wholly static so soon as it is remembered that there are two Jewish problems—the Gentile's and the Jew's.

That Jewish problem which is a strictly Gentile problem is part of the psycho-pathology of the human group. Out of ancestral memories linked with the recurrent experience of present misfortune, such as defeat in war or poverty or pestilence, groups of men will be seized by sharp accesses of the feelings of terror and of guilt. But they desire to feign to themselves not to be in fear of the true objects of their terror, since the natural pagan man holds fear to be shameful, nor do they desire to acknowledge the plain fact that their misfortunes are largely due to their own guilt. The ever-present and recognizably different Jewish minority offers the sick groups a substitute object against which they can wreak their passions and so obtain a measure of relief. The Jews are few and powerless. Therefore they must be wizards or subtle conspirators or diabolically clever. A pagan gentleman can fear *them* without shame, since he attributes to them a kind of strength that he despises. He also holds it shameful to acknowledge guilt. His ultimate ideal is still the Indian brave who lets himself be cut to pieces without a murmur. He attributes his guilt to the Jews. The two defence motives merge into one. The Jew is wicked and guilty. The pagan is brave and guiltless and has been betrayed. Out of this mechanism of the sick pagan group, so-called civilized men, so-called Christian men, have through the ages committed their crimes against the Jewish people—crimes so constant, so cruel, so monstrous, and so undeserved that the natural pagan man, incapable of contrition and so of expiation, incapable of confessing his fear, his guilt, his wrong, is impelled from age to age to commit new crimes on the old

theory of Jewish guilt (which at the core of him he knows to be false) in order to justify to himself his former crimes. And thus from age to age there falls and rises like a malignant fever this disease among the pagan peoples of the world. Is there any hope that the Gentile world will ever free itself from this foul psychical pestilence? At this hour in history, which is marked by a pagan revolt against Christianity, there seems less hope than there was only a few years ago. For the only hope of peace among men and of peace among the pagan nations that the world has ever known came from the possibility of their gradual inner submission to that essential Christianity which, equally cleansed from primitive theophagy and pagan pomp and power, was summed up by the Jew Jesus according to the immemorial ethics of his folk when he declared the first of all commandments to be: Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord; and the second commandment to be none other than the old verse of Leviticus: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, and added, There is none other commandment greater than these. But pagan pride and pagan thirst of blood fill the world more and more today and the evil conscience of the supposed Christians turns more and more against the kinsmen of Him whom they feign to be their God only to recrucify Him under the symbol of His people day by day. There is no hope for the Jews in a pagan world. For they are that world's evil conscience and gnawing worm of the soul. . . .

The Jewish aspect of the Jewish problem is wholly different in kind. Our pagan and warlike period, to which benevolent Gentiles are fond of referring in order to assimilate us to themselves, not only lies in a very remote age, an age on the very edge and rim of authentic history, but differs decisively from all the other pagan periods of the other peoples in that it held, as soil holds seed or as mother-womb holds child, that ethos which, as the Judæo-Christian ethos, was later to oppose itself to the fairly

homogeneous paganism of the Western World. The tribes who conquered Canaan and slew the chieftains of the land were already creating or were, at least, the fathers and mothers of men who were about to create as a symbol of their people's character and eternal fate the central myths (of which the significance quite transcends their historicity or lack of it), of the bondage in Egypt and the liberation therefrom, which, in its own eternal faith obligated this people for ever to tolerance and lovingkindness, forever to the principle that "the stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were sojourners in the land of Egypt." And these rude warriors also created or begot children who created that second myth which stamped for all time the character of Israel, the myth, namely, that this people took upon itself a law of its own choosing and would never again be able to be free of moral compulsion or of the passion for sanctifying the empirical world of experience by the fulfilment of a metaphysical command.

The peoples create their central and characteristic myths in their own image; they believe these myths because the myths correspond to the psychical structure and to the sense of values of those who created them. We read Homer and we know what the Greeks were; we read the *Beowulf* and the *Waltharilied* and the *Nibelungenlied* and we know what were the Germanic tribes who have built up the dominant modern civilizations. "For no greater glory makes beautiful the life of men," says Homer, "than that which is gained for them by strength of hands and thighs." And that is still, at Olympic games and football matches and boxing-bouts, the instinctive reaction of the great pagan masses of the world. No, that is not Homer at his highest. "When ye were children did ye never hear from your fathers how Odysseus bore himself toward his folk? How he hurt the right of none by deeds or words, as is otherwise the wont of mighty kings who persecute some men and

prefer others?" A just king deserves praise. But there is no compulsion to justice, nor dare men demand it. And why was Beowulf great and beloved? Because he was the "victory-blessed hero," the "brave-in-brawl," and when he came to his passing forth his Geatish clansmen mourned him,

Calling him a World-king, the mildest under crown,
And to his kin the kindest and keenest for renown.

The ethical note of the pagan does not greatly vary, south or north: physical prowess and kindness to kinsmen—such are the marks of the mythic hero in whom the pagan saw his ideal.

The ancient Hebrews created gradually through their earlier centuries a mythic hero, too. Like the other peoples, they created their mythic hero in the image of their souls and their ideals. The hero was a teacher—Moshe Rabbenu—the bringer of the divine law to earth. He was very meek, above all the men that were on the face of the earth. Once only did he slay a man, and then out of an overwhelming passion of pity, out of an overwhelming sense of wrong. But when his people sinned against God, he offered himself as a sacrifice for their sin: "Blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written." This mythic hero was the proclaimer of the eternal Oneness of an invisible and transcendental God; he was the author of the first code of law in history that had compassion upon man as man and sought justice for man as man. And being hero of the typical Hebrew folk-myth of the Exodus, he was not contented with justice and kindness to clansmen and kinsmen, but proclaimed over and over again the duty to stranger and to guest. Nor does the depth and exactness with which this duty is inculcated always appear in the current translations of the Hebrew texts. Take so crucial a passage in its phrasing as Numbers 15: 29. A precise rendering is impossible. But the English versions miss subtle points. "For him sprung from among the children of Israel and for the

guest that guesteth or for the none-indigene that dwelleth —*la-ger ha-gar*, there shall be one *kind* of law—*thorah achath*." Such is an approach to the exact phrasing of the original and such the crucial spirit of the folk-hero of the Hebrews fashioned in the image of the Hebrews' soul. How can that soul dwell in the world of Odysseus and Beowulf? Such is the Jewish aspect of the Jewish problem. How can the Jew dwell in a pagan world?

II

Twice in the course of history the Jewish folk-ethos so powerfully founded in the Torah and so definitively universalized in the Prophets seemed for a brief period about to conquer the world. The first time it did so in the guise of an immediate product of Judaism, namely primitive Christianity. The Jesus of the oldest Gospel, the Jesus of Mark, proclaims as the two preëminent and eternal commands, the command to worship the one God and the command to love one's neighbour as oneself. He quotes the Torah verbatim as sufficient for all men. It is hardly necessary at this late date to repeat the story of how this Jesus was soon blended and identified with the scapegoat gods of the pagans from Dionysos to Adonis, and how his celebration of the Passover was turned into a sacrificial theophagous rite; nor how this re-paganized faith was harnessed to the Roman Empires of the East and the West. The world threw off, a bare three centuries after Jesus, the last vestige of his teaching and began gradually to proscribe his religion and his people, the only true exemplars of his religion, in order to prove to itself that the Christ-myth was not superimposed on Jesus of Nazareth but issued from him. Thus arose the pagans' self-justificatory legends concerning the wandering Jew, concerning the witness of the dispersion to the truth of Christ, concerning the cruel hard-heartedness of the Jews who slew the Son of God. The subconscious conflicts of Christendom symbolized by

these legends were, at the end of many ages, revealed from time to time by Protestant reformers and revolutionaries. All or nearly all of them sought Jewish instruction as to the character of the sacred Hebrew texts; all of them had the conscious and honourable aim of returning to that primitive Christianity which imperial Rome had identified with its power and on which it had grafted the old pagan multiplicity of gods. And nearly all the Protestant reformers—the example of Luther is the supreme example—began with a gesture of tolerance and kindness toward the Jewish people. Their psychical process was this: if they could convert the Jews to their kind of Christianity, they would have proved to themselves to have truly returned to that primitive faith which had issued from the womb of the Jewish people. Since they retained the Christ-myth in its totality as well as the Pauline doctrines and dogmas, however, the whole movement could not interest the religious Jew. Thus is to be explained Luther's change of front. He had pleaded for the Jews in the hope that they would bear witness to his cause and its truth. They refused, and he turned upon them with the ferocity of one unsure of himself. More than Rome itself he had now to stamp them as false, stubborn, wicked. The psychical trick is a universal human one. If you hope of a witness that he will exonerate you and the witness refuses, you seek to blacken his character and to destroy his reputation for veracity.

"Every Stoic was a Stoic," Emerson profoundly remarked, "but in Christendom where is the Christian?" That is the whole truth of the matter. The faith and the ethics of Jesus never converted the pagan world. A perception of this central fact of Western history has never been wholly lost. I have heard simple but not unthoughtful American Protestants say: "Christianity is not a failure; it has never been tried." But the great pagan masses have never wanted to try Christianity; yet they feigned to themselves that they were Christians. And so they were forced

to project this inner division of theirs and its accompanying feeling of guilt upon the people who had given Jesus and the religion of Jesus to the world. This is not the whole story. The psychology of human groups makes the way of all minorities a difficult and thorny one. The uniquely tragic fate of the Jewish minority is due to its profound implication with a millennial conflict at the very core of Christendom. It is thus wholly logical that the left wing of the National-Socialists of Germany should repudiate Christianity *in toto* as a loathsome Jewish invention, and it is equally natural that the only utterly sincere friends of the Jewish people are to be found among those Gentiles who have, whether conscious of the source or not, embraced the faith and the ethics of Jesus. In a Christian world the Jew would be loved and honoured. But his attempt to Judaize, that is, to Christianize, the pagan world failed. Until the French Revolution he bore the burden of that failure. He bears it still.

The later eighteenth century saw a second attempt to break the power of paganism in the Western World. The great humanitarians and libertarians of that period opposed the Church and the clergy and thundered against priests as well as against kings. But their essential principles, those principles of human brotherhood and freedom, of liberty, equality, fraternity—venerable words which the French carved even on the Roman churches—were all primitive Christian principles, the principles, namely, that Jesus had proclaimed as he had found them in the Torah and the Prophets. Once again, and this time with incomparable poignancy and power, the ethics of the Hebrews beat upon the stubborn pagan heart of the world. Nor were the men of that day unaware of the origin of their principles. "Imitate Jesus and Socrates," wrote Benjamin Franklin in his diary. "As individuals," Thomas Paine exclaimed, "we profess ourselves Christians, but as nations we are heathen, Roman and what not." Justice to the weak, justice and mercy to the stranger and the widow

and the fatherless, to the poor and the oppressed, such was precisely in the spirit and often the very phrasing of the Prophets of Israel, the end and aim of all the best and strongest spirits of that now wrongly discredited and obscured period from Voltaire to Jefferson and from Rousseau to Shelley. All of them battled against the stubborn assumptions of paganism: the right of brute force, the joy in conflict among men, the insistence upon loyalties without acceptable ethical content. Neither the excesses of the French Revolution nor the wars and brutal legitimist movements of the succeeding years could wholly subdue that new spirit of justice and brotherhood and liberty that had arisen in the world, and so it is no wonder that all during this period the Jews broke the bonds of the Ghettos, both the physical and the spiritual bonds, because they felt that an ethos akin to their own was abroad upon earth and that Western civilization was being depaganized, was being Christianized or Judaized at last, and that hence they might live within it in peace. And to meet them came the Gentiles who had embraced the new doctrines of liberty and brotherhood and justice, and so there came about, earliest in America and France, next in England, gradually in country after country, the emancipation of Jewry, to the memories and to the principles of which many thousands of Jews in the Western countries still cling with a feeble and pathetic and altogether justified yearning. Remembering the handsome principles of the humanitarian and libertarian age, and hearing many Gentiles still with all apparent sincerity profess them, they cannot reconcile themselves to the bitter fact that the second attempt of the Western World to put aside its pagan brutality has failed even as the first failed. To these Jews it seems incredible that men should not love liberty and tolerance. They forget that it was the author of Deuteronomy and Amos who invented these concepts. The Jews themselves invented them. They are native to the Jewish soul. But the pagan libertarian, like the Christian, is a

convert, and converts, alas! have a habit of relapsing, and today, in this year 1935, two-thirds of the Western World has relapsed into pagan barbarism and only, or almost only, in France and Britain and America are there left any profoundly sincere Gentile Christians and liberals, any men and women who have put aside the old pagan Adam of their ancestors and accepted the ethos first proclaimed by the teachers and prophets of Israel. Hence the Jew is once more plunged into all the horrors of a pagan world, to which he has no inner relation and which, in its turn, wreaks upon him more brutally than ever its evil conscience for having twice and in a twofold manner betrayed the faiths it professed and crucified its Christ.

Thus it is clear that the Jewish problem for the Jew is the same with which he has striven for over two thousand years: How shall he live in this pagan world of war and force and inhumanity, this Christless and unconverted world, which is not only alien to all his principles and instincts, but burdens him with a hatred which his folk-soul feels and even, though subconsciously, understands? For the psychological method of explaining human action, which is the most imaginative as well as the most merciful of methods, has been immemorially known among the Jewish people. In the Talmudic tractate of Sota is recorded the observation of R. Abba ben Kahana: "It is as though a man were impelled to pronounce a curse upon himself but hangs or projects it upon another." The Jew knows, though he often prefers in pitiful and pardonable defence of his minimum human comforts not to know. He is, to vary slightly the fine lines of A. E. Housman, "a stranger and afraid in a world he never made." And that world, which is deeply impelled to pronounce a curse upon itself, pronounces it upon *him*. He may and does with all his heart coöperate with all Christians, with all libertarians everywhere in the world. It is not enough, and the Christians and the libertarians, the Gentiles who share his ethos and have assimilated themselves to his instincts, are

fighting everywhere in the world today a retreating action, and paganism engulfs land after land. What is the Jew to do?

III

Nor is this all. The libertarian movement out of which arose the emancipation of the Jews was not a perfectly instructed or perfectly realistic movement. It was an affair of passion and of the abstract intellect. It tried to refashion the world according to its heart's desire without a sufficient regard for the world's uncomfortable realities. Except in the young American commonwealth where the sociological facts fitted in with its theories, it went too far and yet not far enough, and thus gave all the pagan sinister forces of the world an opening to undo its work from the beginning. The early libertarians dreamed with Shelley of a humanity that was to be tribeless and nationless, wholly uncircumscribed and free. But no such thing exists. Men exist only in species and tribes and nations. There is no such thing as an abstract man. Hence in antecedent theory the Jews were emancipated on the ground that they were abstract human beings, which was false; in hard practice it was demanded of them that, in exchange for their civic rights, they de-Judaize themselves, that they give up their social organizations, their folk-ways, their memories and aspirations and their very instincts. A subtle and tragic thing happened, of which the echoes are still to be heard among Jews even in this year of doom. On the theory of the early libertarians the Jews feigned to themselves that they were giving up their Jewishness in exchange for an abstract and nobler humanity above all nations. In hard practice, as was inevitable, they were asked to be Germans and Frenchmen and even Russians and Poles, and to live and to die for these peoples according to the dictates of the pagan nationalisms of rivalry and hatred and war, and far from rising to a higher and more universal level of

human living, they descended, especially in the West, from the status of an international community of brethren upheld by a common ethos and common aspirations into the helots and the henchmen of warring tribes.

No sensible man will seek to detract from the magnificent contributions made to the civilization of the world by the Jews in the brief period since their emancipation. But the fateful question arises and has indeed troubled the profoundest Jewish minds for several decades: Why have our devotion and our creative living within the Gentile civilizations not brought us peace and at least tolerance and freedom? Why are we embattled today and brutally attacked on every front of the so-called civilized world as we have not been since the Middle Ages? Because the emancipation carried a wrong and a falsehood at its core. It feigned a Judæo-Christian ideology; it was translated into practice according to brutal pagan use. The Jews thought they were to be free men; the pagans desired them to be henchmen and loyal and obedient tribesmen, obedient to the point of complete spiritual evisceration, to the point of self-obliteration and of living death. This command the Jews could not fulfil, as, in truth, no men could. The most assimilated and preëminent Westerners of Jewish lineage still preserved in their psychical physiognomy, if in nothing else, the unmistakable and eternal stamp of Israel. And this inevitable fact has again and again infuriated the pagan peoples of the world. In brief, the emancipation was never a true emancipation, which must be an emancipation toward being what you are and desire to be; its tolerance was veiled intolerance, for tolerance has no meaning unless it is a tolerance of difference, an acceptance and even an appreciation of the other-ness of the other, of the *Eigenart* of that fellow-man whom you are feigning to tolerate. The emancipation of Jewry carried an implication subtler, more deadly, and yet not less tragically absurd and contrary to possibility as would have been an implication in Abraham Lincoln's proclaiming of the

freedom of the slaves that that freedom and its resultant rights were conditioned upon the black men becoming white men within two generations.

Why has it been so hard for Jews who are commonly subtle of mind enough to pierce this coil of error and of wrong and to understand that the first emancipation has proved a failure and that we are on the inevitable and fateful threshold of a second emancipation and self-emancipation which will require of us all our strength and all our courage and all our wisdom? Well, it is hard to give up the hopes and the comforts and even the errors of several generations. And not only was so much hoped, but very much was achieved. Nor should it be forgotten that especially the Jewish intellectual, above all in the English-speaking countries, has Gentile friends who are Christians and not pagans, and who share, from the noblest motives, his illusions and his hesitations. And so in spite of murder and torture, of the rubber truncheon and the concentration camp, of brutal extrusion from one economic order after another, and of a mounting world conjuration against the very life of Israel, there are still Jews who try to live in a pagan world upon the old, false, hopeless terms. But there is still another and a better reason. The Jew can understand the Christian. He has no difficulty with Emerson and Lincoln. He is at one with them in spirit and in aspiration. He does not understand the pagan. He hopes against hope that the pagan does not quite mean his meanings, which are so obscure to the Jew. For in all the many commands in the Torah concerning justice to the stranger, the *ger*, concerning mercy and love to him and equality for him, there is never the shadow of a hint that the stranger must first acquire a right to justice and mercy by becoming other than he is, by ceasing to be a *ger*, a guest or stranger. It is precisely because he is not an Israelite that he is to be protected and given not only equality but love. "Love ye, therefore, the stranger, for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt—*Va-achab'them eth ha-ger khi*

gerim heyiythem b'ereetz Mizrayim!" The pagan cannot understand that, and the Jew, though he may never have read these words of the Torah, can understand nothing else. To unspoiled Jewish instinct it is blazingly self-evident that tolerance of your fellow-men is a duty that admits of no condition, and that equality has no meaning if you are to buy it with the warping of your soul. It is the pagan who demands his pound of flesh, which we have tried to give him from next our very hearts; it is the Jew who does not chaffer and bargain at the counter of humanity. . . . For precisely similar reasons it is entirely inaccurate to compare Jewish nationalism, the reintegration of the Jew with his folk and culture, the reintegration of a part of the Jewish people with its ancestral soil, with the other nationalisms that fill the world with their rivalries and hatreds and with their arrogance and lust after power. Jewish nationalism is Jewish—that is to say, in the deepest and original sense, Christian; it issues from a moral instinct and a moral vision for ever separate from the life of the pagan and all its works.

The emancipation having failed, for reasons that must now be clear, what are we to do? How are we to go about for a third time to solve our problem of living in a pagan world? We must reëmancipate ourselves upon other and upon truer terms. We must reject the pagan demand of paying with our spiritual destruction for an apparent equality. We must cleanse ourselves of the servility and falseness and inner division which the attempt to meet that demand has brought upon us. We must reintegrate ourselves with our culture, our instincts, the very sources of our being. We must be Jews, and as such we must demand of a world that feigns to be a Christian world our rights as individuals, as minority groups, as a people in the land of our fathers. We must strive after the coöperation of all free men in the world, of all Christian men in the world. And at last we must ask that coöperation and that friendship upon honourable terms—as Jews, as conscious bearers

of one of the world's great spiritual civilizations and *therefore* as men and brethren, not as suppliants, imitators, henchmen, and hangers-on. How clear that should be to any unspoiled human instinct! But precisely the gravest wrong done us by the false emancipation, the emancipation offered and accepted upon false and dishonourable terms, is the warping and defiling of our instincts and the disintegration of thousands upon thousands of Jewish souls. Hence our immediate task is to cure the warped and broken soul of Jews and to make them worthy of *being* Jews. The spiritual wounds of the emancipation must be healed. To save the Jewish people we must convert that people to itself and every Jew who puts off the falseness and dishonour of servile assimilation and puts on the new man of his reintegration with his people shall know that he is helping to save not only Israel, but a world pagan and unredeemed.

REBIRTH

MOSES HESS

A mind of the first order which wiser generations will re-discover. Hess was born in Bonn in 1812. His intellectual development was guided by Hegel and Spinoza. Something of prophetic zeal lived in him from the first. At twenty-five he published *Heilige Geschichte der Menschheit* (*The Holy History of Humanity*), signed "by a disciple of Spinoza," in which he foreshadowed nearly all that can be argued for Communism on the grounds of humanity and peace. In *Die Europäische Triarchie* (1841) (*European Triarchy*) he was the first to propose a United States of Europe for the elimination of conflict. In the same year he founded with other left-wing Hegelians the *Rheinische Zeitung*, of which Karl Marx soon became the editor. It was Hess, in fact, whose germinal mind passed on to Marx and Friederich Engels the essentials of their earlier theories. The *Rhenish Journal* being suppressed by the government, Hess collaborated with Engels on his *Gesellschafts-spiegel* (*Mirror of Society*). But already sharp differences arose which led to a complete break when Marx and Engels issued their "Communist Manifesto" in 1848. The reasons for this break are of the highest contemporary interest. Although L. Büchner's *Kraft und Stoff* (*Energy and Matter*) was not published until seven years later, the coarse and ill-grounded materialism of that work was in the air. Marx and Engels were committed not only to it, but to the purely economic interpretation of history, and Communism allied itself once and for all with a crude and transient and childish one-sided theory of the sum of things. Hess, being both a scientist and a philosopher, was forced to part company with the movement he had himself created. He suspected and announced in the eighteen hun-

dred and sixties that the atom is a centre of electrical energy; he knew, as all sane men have always known, that urgent as bread may be, it furnishes but a fraction of man's necessary nourishment. Hence he knew too that the culture-groups (or races or nations or what one likes) exist and function as such in history and that the division of mankind into mere internationally horizontal economic classes corresponds to but a single aspect of reality which will probably always remain artificial and secondary. Hence Hess, without abandoning his own communist principles, withdrew from the movement and during many years of residence first in Geneva, later in Paris, devoted himself more and more to the study of his people's history and fate. The mature fruit of these studies is the work *Rom und Jerusalem* (1862), from which certain pages are here presented for the first time in English. The book made no public impression in its own day. As scientist, sociologist, and Jewish thinker, Hess was from a quarter to half a century in advance of his time. More than thirty years after its publication men taught not only by Pinsker and Herzl but, above all, by the iron march of history, discovered *Rom und Jerusalem* to have been the first classic of the modern Jewish rebirth in which all the chief ideas of that movement had been either explicitly stated or powerfully foreshadowed. During the last years of his life Hess became an influential factor in the work, both practical and scholarly, of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. He died in 1875. It is not impossible that even as his Jewish philosophy was re-discovered as a living force, so some day his conception of communism may displace the narrow and brutal notions that now go by that name.

MOSES HESS

(1812-1875)

I

A Living People

TO THE peoples once thought of as dead, who today in the consciousness of their historic task demand the rights of nationality, there belongs unquestionably, too, the Jewish people. Not in vain has it during two millennia resisted the storms of history; not in vain has it from all the ends of the earth turned its countenance, as it still does, toward Jerusalem. With the sure instinct of its historic and cultural vocation to unite man and his world and to create human brotherhood, this people has preserved its nationality *within* its religion and has connected both inseparably with the inalienable land of its fathers. It follows that no modern people, fighting for its fatherland, can refuse theirs to the Jews, without creating for itself a deadly contradiction which will destroy its own faith and end in moral suicide.

II

Vain Flight

So long as the Jew bore persecution and humiliation as God's punishment and trusted in the eventual reconstitution of his nation, his pride could not be wounded. His

single duty was to preserve himself and his people toward a future which would indemnify the nation for all the evil suffered, which would revenge every hurt and reward every loyalty. This faith and hope the enlightened modern Jews have lost. Hence to them every false accusation is at once an injury done them as citizens and an insult offered them as men of honour. How has the emancipation helped them and what does it profit them that occasionally a Jew may be alderman or parliamentarian or even minister of state, so long as a stain sticks to the very name "Jew" which any snob or fool or scribbler can capitalize with certain success?

So long as the Jew will continue to deny his nationality, because he has not the self-denial to declare his solidarity with an unhappy, persecuted, and derided people, just so long his false position will grow daily more unendurable.

Why deceive ourselves? The peoples of Europe have never regarded the presence of the Jews among themselves as anything but an anomaly. We shall always remain strangers among the nations who may, as a matter of humanity and justice, emancipate us, but who will never esteem us so long as we prefer as principle and faith the mere *ubi bene ibi patria* to the great historic memories of our people.

Granted that in civilized countries religious fanaticism no longer pursues our enlightened brethren with its hatred. In spite of enlightenment and emancipation the Jew of the dispersion who denies his nationality will not gain the respect of the peoples in whose midst he can be naturalized as a citizen, but cannot be released from the solidarity that binds him to his own people. It is not the old-fashioned pious Jew, ready to undergo any torment rather than deny his people, who is the object of contempt; it is the modern Jew who, like the German renegade in foreign lands, denies his nation because upon it lies the heavy hand of fate. The handsome phrases concerning humanity and progress which this modern Jew

uses so liberally in order to conceal his want of solidarity with his unhappy brethren will not protect him from the stern judgment of the opinion of mankind. In vain will he seek to establish a geographical or philosophical alibi. . . . Assume a thousand masks, change your names, religion and habits, and creep, if you can, incognito through the world, so that none shall know you are Jews—yet every affront to the Jewish name will wound you more sorely than it will the upright Jew who stands and falls with his people and his people's honour.

III

The Folk in the East

In those lands that divide the East from the West there live millions of our brethren who pray passionately day and night to the God of our fathers for the restoration of our kingdom. It is they who have more truly preserved the living kernel of Judaism, namely, its national aspiration, than our Occidental brethren who seek to revivify everything in the faith of their fathers except the one thing that created the faith and carried it triumphantly through all the storms of time. . . . To those faithful millions in the East I would go and cry to them: Let not your flag droop, my people! In you is the living seed which has not through the many centuries lost its power to germinate and which will once more bear fruit when it has burst the hard shell that now shuts it in and is replanted in the soil of the present under the warmth and dew of the living sky.

The rigid forms of orthodox Judaism, which were thoroughly justified until this century, can be properly and naturally burst only from within through the power of the living idea of our nationality and its historic civilization. Only and alone out of the national rebirth can the religious genius of the Jew once more draw new strength

and once more be reanimated by the holy spirit of the prophets.

IV

The Jewish Religion

Unlike the Christian religion, the Jewish religion cannot be threatened by the nationalistic or humanitarian aspirations of our time which, indeed, lead us back to the real foundations of Judaism. It is an error brought by Christianity into the modern world that a philosophical vision of life is to be identified with rigid dogmas. I shall not say with Mendelssohn that Judaism knows no dogma, but it can be asserted that our teachings have never been considered either completed or petrified. They have, rather, on the characteristic basis of the divine oneness of all life, developed with the free development of the spirit both of the Jewish people and of all mankind. In fact, the free development of ultimate knowledge by tireless study and conscientious research is the foremost religious duty of the Jew. That is the reason why Judaism has never negated philosophical thinking or stamped it as heresy and why, above all, it never occurred to a real Jew to seek to reform Judaism on the basis of any philosophical system. Hence there could never arise any strictly sectarian divisions in Judaism.

Though in very recent times both orthodox and heterodox zealots on dogmatic points have arisen in Judaism, yet it has never come to a schism, because the dogmatic basis of Judaism leaves free play to the flexible creative activity of the intellect. Jews have always entertained widely divergent opinions on metaphysical points, and Judaism knows only the apostate excluded by his own will and act. "And even he does not truly exist," said a learned rabbi in whose presence I expressed these views. And he was right. For by virtue of its rootedness in nationalism

Judaism is not a faith that can be replaced by another. By his descent a Jew belongs to Judaism, even though his ancestors or he himself have apostasized. According to current notions of religion this may appear paradoxical. In practice it will be observed that even the baptized Jew remains a Jew, however much he may struggle against the fact. A friend of mine whose grandparents embraced Christianity is more deeply concerned for the weal or woe of the Jewish people than many a circumcized brother and has retained a clearer sense of our national solidarity than our so-called enlightened rabbis.

V

Light from the Past

I cannot refrain from making the observation that the epoch of Hispano-Jewish culture seems actually to have solved a grave problem—the problem, namely, how Jews can be nationalistic and patriotic Jews in the strictest and fullest sense of the word and yet share so richly in the culture and the civic life of the country of their citizenship, that this country truly becomes their second fatherland.

VI

Judaism and Humanity

I am persuaded that the national character of Judaism not only does not exclude humanity and true civilization, but leads to these as its necessary consequence. If, nevertheless, I emphasize the nationalistic roots of Judaism at the expense of its humanitarian blossoms, that is because in our day people are too apt to adorn their buttonholes with the handsome flowers of civilization, and never dream of cultivating the soil from which they draw their life.

The entire modern humanitarian view of life has arisen out of Judaism. There is nothing in Christian morals, nor in the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages nor in contemporary philanthropic movements, nor, if we include Spinozism, the last great manifestation of the Jewish spirit, is there anything in modern philosophy that is not rooted in Judaism. Until the French Revolution the Jewish people was the only one in whose cult and faith nationalism and a concern for all humanity were united. It is through Judaism that the history of all mankind has assumed a sacred character, that is to say, a homogeneous and organic development which, beginning with loving-kindness within the family, was conceived of as incomplete until the whole of humanity came to be as one family, of which the members are as deeply welded into solidarity by the creative genius of the historic process as are the various organs of a living body by the directive power of nature.

So long as no people but the Jewish had this conception of history according to which the nation is the *road* to all mankind, the Jews were in truth the only people of God. Since the great revolution that sprang up in France we have noble rivals and true allies first in the French people and next in those peoples who embraced the principles of the revolution. Now if these peoples really triumph over the forces of reaction, the humanitarian ideals of our age, in so far as they are sincerely entertained, will become genuinely effective. But these ideals, in so far as they seek to obliterate the existence of nationalities, are just as sterile as the hostile and merely nationalistic notions of the reactionaries. In merely theoretical anti-nationalistic humanitarianism I cannot help seeing, to put it mildly, more vague idealism than sense of reality. We are treated to such doses of liberal perfume and humanitarian chloroform that we are temporarily deadened to the pain that should be felt over the indisputable antagonisms that still exist among the branches of the human family. These antago-

nisms are not likely to be destroyed by cheerful sermonizing. The development that can alone help us must take place according to laws as unchangeable as those of physical nature. For precisely as nature produces no generalized flowers and fruits, animals and plants, but only specific genera and species, so in history we meet not abstract man, but folk-types only. Humanity and the union of mankind shall be our goal. But human society, as it exists, is still in a process of development. What we find in history are widely differing groups of men who first merely co-existed; next they began to fight and some to absorb others; they must strive toward the freedom of once again peacefully coexisting and coöperating without the sacrifice of the specific character of any. No attempt at a blank fusion or obliteration of the existing civilizations and varying cultures will lead to peace among men. People confuse an effort toward the organization of social peace among the types of man and culture that exist with a falsely assumed similarity or even identity among men. Equality cannot properly be based upon such an assumption. The reconciliation of the peoples must be accomplished upon a more realistic basis than that of an impossible fusion of men and their civilizations. The first task of today is to let the various folk-types be free to follow their necessary developments.

VII

The Last Word

The great masses of the Jewish people will not be able to participate in the great historic movements of the age until they have a Jewish fatherland. So long as these masses remain in their anomalous position, the relatively few Jews who by insensate efforts seek for themselves some way of escape from this false position will suffer far more

brutally than the masses themselves. For the latter, though they may not be happy, will not be dishonoured. Hence no Jew, whatever his shade of belief, can withdraw from co-operating in the resurgence of his people and the very apostate is pledged for ever to the rebirth of Israel.

1862

LEON PINSKER

The life and experiences of Dr. Pinsker are almost a paradigm of the intellectual development of the modern Jew. He was born in Russian Poland in 1821 and in his earlier years (circa 1850-1860) shared the work and aspirations of that group of Russian Jews who believed that assimilation—*i.e.*, sincere cultural and political Russification would bring to Russian Jewry the equality of rights that other Jews were winning in other lands. Hence he contributed to the first Jewish periodical in the Russian language and worked very actively within the Society for the Spread of Education among Russian Jews. The social, intellectual, and political resistance which these efforts encountered convinced Pinsker not only as a man, but as a man of science, that this way was not the way. In vain he sought to communicate his doubts and cognitions to the leaders of Western Jewry. On his return to Russia he wrote in German and published in 1882 his since famous pamphlet *Autoemancipation: A Warning to his Fellows. By a Russian Jew*. Readers of the following extracts will observe not only Pinsker's radical (*radix* means root!) dealing with the Jewish question, but in his description and diagnosis of Judæophobia an extraordinarily prophetic attitude to certain psychological phenomena. His dealing with anti-Semitism as a "mass-neurosis" which, being such, is unreachable by facts or actions in the daylight world, anticipates a psychological analysis far beyond his day. He drew the inevitable conclusion of the necessary reintegration, both cultural and territorial, of the Jewish people, became the leader of the *Choveve Zion* (Lovers of Zion) movement and called that first memorable conference at Kattowitz (1884) which gave organized form to vague

aspiration. Later and until his death he also presided over the Odessa Committee for aiding Jewish workers and colonists in Palestine. He coöperated with Edmond de Rothschild and, though attacked by orthodox leaders, continued his work until his death in 1891, leaving the heritage of his ideals to Achad Ha'Am (*q.v.*). It is worth emphasizing once again that the life of Jehuda Loeb Pinsker is the first classical example of that fate and story of the best and most sensitive of modern Jews, which by virtue of its inevitable recurrence will some day become legend, history, myth: passionate love for Europe and loyalty to it; the desire to blend with that at least once brilliant and victorious world; the disillusion when that world shows its brutal paganism under the ideals which it mouthed but did not mean; the return to Israel as the living embodiment of the only ideals by which a Jew can live.

LEON PINSKER

(1821-1891)

From Autoemancipation

Most of the attributes by which, according to definition, a nation is recognizable as such, are lacking to the Jewish people. It does not know that deeply and pervasively self-originating life which is unimaginable without common ways and common speech and concentration in space. The Jewish people has no country; it has a number of countries; it has neither centre nor centre of gravity, neither a government of its own nor governmental representation. It is present everywhere and at home nowhere. The nations have never had dealings with a Jewish nation—only with Jews. Yet to become a nation the Jews lack that essential and necessary characteristic which consists of their dwelling together upon a national territory. This characteristic could not, it is clear, be acquired in the dispersion. Among many Jews, on the contrary, even the memory of their ancient fatherland seems extinguished. Due to their excessive power of adaptation, they have easily assimilated the peculiarities of the peoples in whose midst fate has placed them. They go farther, seeking often to strip themselves of all their traditional traits in order to curry favour with their masters. They have, in addition, appropriated or suggested to themselves certain cosmopolitan tendencies as unfit for others as for themselves.

Striving to become amalgamated with the other peoples, they have deprived themselves of the inner cheer of their

own national being, yet they have nowhere persuaded their fellow-citizens to regard them as truly autochthonous.

What chiefly keeps Jews of every shade from a proper national form of life is the fact that they no longer feel the need of it. Not content, finally, with not feeling this need, they go to the length of denying its legitimacy.

When a patient no longer feels the need of taking any kind of nourishment, his condition is evidently exceedingly grave. The physician will not always succeed in rousing him from this fatal stupor. But even if this be painfully done the patient's life cannot be saved unless his system is still able to absorb the nourishment which he has been persuaded to desire.

Well, the condition of the Jewish people today is precisely that of such a patient. Let us insist above all on this capital point. For it needs to be proved that the ills of the Jews arise principally from their lack of a desire for national independence. It needs to be proved that this desire must be awakened and kept a living desire within them if they would no longer ignominiously vegetate. They must, in brief, desire to become a nation once more.

The exceptional condition of the Jews is largely due to the fact, rarely given its due weight, that in the eyes of the other peoples they are not an independent nation. Yet this is the secret of both their inferior position and of their immense distress. The mere fact of belonging to this people seems an indelible stigma which repels the Gentile and is troublesome to the Jew himself. Nevertheless this entire phenomenon is explicable from the very nature of man himself.

In the midst of the living nations of earth stalk the Jews—a nation dead long, long ago. With their country they lost their independence and ever since that far-off time they have been hollowed out by a process of decomposition that is incompatible with the completeness of essential organic life. Annihilated by Rome, their state disappeared from the sight of mankind. But though forced to renounce

existence as a polity and though forced to abandon the direction of its political destiny, the Jewish people found itself powerless to sink into complete annihilation and has never ceased, spiritually at least, to live in the guise of a people. And ever since, the world has seen the spectacle of a people that is like the eerie apparition of one dead still moving about among the living. This phantom apparition, as of a ghost, as of one dead rubbing elbows with living men, of a people which, though no longer alive, still wanders *as such* through the sunshine of the world, this troubling figure, without analogy in all history, without example or parallel, how could it fail to awaken a sense of horror and fear in the dull masses of humanity? . . .

Terror of the Jewish phantom is passed on from generation to generation and from age to age. It has grown stronger with the centuries. Through circumstances that we shall presently examine it has finally hardened into a phobia.

This *Judæophobia* with all the notions that belong to such a disease, whether spontaneous or superstitious, whether instinctive or idiosyncratic, has ended by being firmly established among all the peoples with whom the Jews have come in contact. It is a variety of demonophobia, but with this important distinction, that it is the psychical disease not of scattered savage tribes, but of all mankind. Nor is this all. The phantom that is feared in this instance is not like other phantoms. It is made of flesh and blood and suffers cruelly under the blows dealt it by the frightened crowd which believes itself menaced by the phantom.

Judæophobia is a mass-neurosis. It is heritable. It has been transmitted from parent to child for two thousand years. It is incurable.

It is the fear of ghosts from which Judæophobia springs that has aroused this abstract hatred, this—one is tempted to say—platonic hatred which saddles the entire Jewish people with the real or feigned faults of individual Jews

and condemns a nation to live under the shadow of calumny and the lash of unmerited reprobation.

In all ages both friends and enemies of the Jews have sought to explain or to justify this hatred. Hence the varied and senseless accusations that have been brought against the Jews. They are supposed to have crucified Christ, to have drunk Christian blood, to have poisoned the wells, to have been the sole usurers and oppressors of the peasantry. When one examines these accusations against a whole people, as well as a thousand others, one finds them to be wholly without foundation. The very fact of their quite indiscriminate use suffices to prove their brittleness. It is perfectly clear that what the persecutors needed were excuses wherewith to quiet their evil conscience. They needed to rationalize the antecedent verdict pronounced against an entire people; they needed to prove to themselves that the Jew or, rather, the Jewish phantom, should be burned. By trying to prove too much, they ended by proving nothing at all. For, though one can justly bring certain reproaches against the Jew, as against any human type, it was fantastic to attribute to him the hideous vices and inexpiable crimes that would call for the extermination of an entire people. The accusations were, in addition, constantly disproved by the concrete facts of experience that Jews and Gentiles, when closely intermingled, come not only to an excellent understanding with each other, but very often sustain relations of the sincerest friendship. But for that very reason the accusations have had to be *general* accusations, all of a piece and so never denying their *a priori* origin. . . .

Hatred, at all events, has been the companion of the Jew through long centuries. It is useless to blind oneself to the fact that the Jews are the chosen people of the world's hatred. However divided the Gentile nations may be in their instincts and aspirations, they tend to unite in their common aversion toward the Jew; it is the one point on which they can establish immediate agreement. The

intensity and the forms of this aversion depend, of course, on the degree of civilization reached by a given people. But the thing itself exists everywhere and always. It may manifest itself by acts of violence, or else by a base envy or even under the mask of toleration or benevolence. But whether one is robbed because one is a Jew or protected because one is a Jew, the two things are equally humiliating to one's sense of human dignity, and equally painful.

Now if it be agreed that Judæophobia is part and parcel of the atavistic burden of mankind's superstitions, it follows clearly that all logical methods of combating the hostility against us must be futile. We can once and for all put an end to those tiresome apologies which are bound to be sterile and wholly unavailing against the emotions of superstitious fear. Prejudice and bad faith will yield to no proof. If one has not the physical force to limit or blunt these or other manifestations of the blind cruelty of nature, one must seek to withdraw oneself from their action.

Deep in the subconscious life of the peoples is the source of their prejudice against the Jews. But it must not be forgotten that there are other and obvious factors that render it impossible for the Jews either to amalgamate with the other peoples or to be treated by them as peers and equals.

No people has any particular fondness for foreigners. This is a basic fact of group psychology and need not be imputed as a crime to anyone. The trouble with the position of the Jew is that he does not even find himself in the position of a normal foreigner in a country not his own. For the latter can go home to his own country and there can in a sense pay himself back for the slights and humiliations he has suffered. Moreover, the non-Jew, when he dwells in a foreign land, is perfectly free to follow his personal interests without awakening suspicion or provoking scandal. He can even associate with countrymen of his own living in the same foreign land for the defence of their common interests, nor does anyone expect him to make a

show of transferred patriotism. The Jew, on the contrary, is neither autochthonous in his own country nor has he the normal privileges of a foreigner, of a stranger, despite the fact that he is the classical example of the stranger. He is neither friend nor enemy; he is a mysterious creature about whom one thing only is definite; he has no country. Men have no great confidence in foreigners, nor will they put their trust in the Jew. But the normal stranger will receive hospitality on the principle that he and his country can and do make a return in kind. But the Jew cannot do that and hence his claim to hospitality is hollow and abnormal. He is not a guest. What is he in the end but a suppliant, a beggar? And what beggar was ever welcome? The Jew solicits protection. How easy to refuse. And there is no one to represent his interests. He has no country to which he can withdraw and behind the frontiers of which he can be safe. He is without protection and his distress is without limits. The laws of no land are written for his benefit. Laws have been passed against him, and even where equality before the law is granted him that very equality needed to be established by legal enactment. . . .

It is necessary to repeat that the Jew is nowhere considered autochthonous. It does not help him to have been born in a given land or to have in it the graves of his ancestors. He is usually treated like the child of a concubine or a Cinderella. In the most favourable cases his status is that of an adopted son; he is never considered legitimate; his rights are never incontestable. The German, the Slav, the Celt, each in his pride of race, will never grant the Jew to be an equal. And though men of high cultivation will recognize the Jew's claim to all rights, even the goodwill of such will never forget the Jew in the fellow-citizen. The civic emancipation of Jewry was the utmost that we wrung from the nineteenth century. It is clear by now that civic emancipation did not lead to social emancipation. The

granting of legal equality has utterly failed to normalize the position of the Jew within the structure of society.

For it must not be forgotten that the emancipation of Jewry was justified by reason, by considerations of abstract justice, and by an enlightened self-interest. It was never the spontaneous expression of a human sentiment. And as it was never demanded by a feeling natural to the peoples, so it will never be considered self-evidently right. Nowhere is it deeply enough rooted in public consciousness to raise it above discussion. It remains always a splendid gift given to a beggar people. Hence the Jew can never forget that the daily bread of civic rights had to be *granted* him. He is isolated and an anomaly whether he is persecuted *or* tolerated *or* protected *or* emancipated. . . .

In the struggle for existence, finally, who will not prefer the interests of his own people to that of strangers? And if this applies to normal foreigners who are equals and protected by their nations, how much more acutely will it apply to the Jew! All obstacles will be put in his way. If, despite these, he gains some success, then woe to him above all!

But for the precarious position of Jews it is not even necessary for them to attain any success. Where great masses of them are concentrated, as in Poland, they can be reduced to the most ghastly poverty without silencing the cry and the reproach that they are the exploiters of the people of the land.

Let us sum up what has here been said: Among the living the Jew seems a ghost; to those indigenous to a land he seems a stranger; among long-settled populations he has the air of a vagabond; the possessing classes consider him a beggar, and the poor an exploiter and a millionaire. To the patriot he is a man without a country, and to all classes a detested competitor.

Upon these primal antagonisms are based that multitude of misunderstandings and reproaches and accusations which fill the world with their tumult. And the Jews, in

place of recognizing their situation in its true character and governing their conduct accordingly, try to move heaven and earth with their appeal to an incorruptible justice and imagine that that will lead to anything. The Gentiles, for their part, instead of justifying their attitude by their numerical superiority and brute force, a realistic and historic point of view, rack their brains to find justification for their hostility by means of a coil of accusations at once unreal and contradictory.

He who desires to be impartial and to avoid utopian dreams in his judgment of earthly realities and who truly desires to reach practical and useful conclusions, will not place the exclusive responsibility for the situation here analyzed on either of the parties concerned. But to the Jews, who alone interest us here, he will say: "You are indeed a folk both mad and despicable. You are mad because, wretched and afraid, you expect through the evil centuries of human nature the one thing that is most alien to men—humanity. And you are despicable because you have permitted yourselves to lose both true self-esteem and the sense of your own dignity as a nation."

1880

THEODOR HERZL

That the founder of political Zionism was a Viennese journalist and playwright is not without its significance for the total psychology of the Jewish problem. In Vienna self-negating assimilationism had reached its lowest depth. The point of saturation of the Jewish nature with non-Jewish values had been passed and was to be passed again and again in succeeding years. Hence that nature developed both the diseases of this specific condition and the cures for them. It may be emphasized once more that Sigmund Freud, though still happily alive, is by four years the senior of Theodor Herzl. The latter was born in Budapest in 1860, but was identified with Vienna from very early years. It is there that he pursued his legal and literary studies and joined the staff of the *Neue Freie Presse*, then as now owned by the Benedikt family, whom neither Herzl nor the tragic developments of later years have weaned from their servile assimilationism. In 1891 the paper sent Herzl to Paris as its correspondent there. But only inattentive readers of the impressive opening pages of the "Diaries" will repeat the statement that the Dreyfus case in 1894 was anything but the final occasion and not the cause of his prophetic dream and activity. Though so profoundly identified with Germanic life and culture and though always so dignified and comely, he had heard behind him both the "Hep, Hep" and the "Saujud" of the rabble. Doubtless he repressed these isolated memories from time to time; doubtless the Paris populace clamouring for the blood of an innocent Jew taught him their entire meaning. But the completeness of *Der Judenstaat* (composed in 1895) both as plan and as vision,

points to a sharp crystallization of spiritual substances long present and active within him.

The wonder of the phenomenon of Herzl, both as fact and as symbol, resides in these circumstances: Herzl was culturally wholly assimilated; he possessed no Jewish knowledge; he was wholly ignorant of the work and vision of his predecessors from the *Choveve Zion* on; he never entirely transcended those characteristics of the second-rate Jewish-Viennese man of letters which Jacob Wassermann emphasized in order to excuse *his* inveterate blindness to the cause of his people and to his own redemption as man and artist. And yet Theodor Herzl burned through the Western World a path of prophetic fire; he saw with incomparable immediacy the one thing needful, the thing that has come to pass and that is today unthinkable without him. No wonder that he has become hero and legend, watchword and beacon-light.

Upon the publication of *Der Judenstaat* in 1896 the scattered Zionists of the world gathered about him; Max Nordau (*q.v.*) and others of lesser fame became his disciples; he developed at once an extraordinary activity as both propagandist and organizer and was able to assemble in 1897 in Basel that first Zionist Congress of 197 delegates which marks for all time the reawakening of the Jews as a people. Here was formulated and accepted the Basel program which demands the "creation in Palestine of a home for the Jewish people guaranteed by public legal sanctions"—the program which is still the core of all effort toward the redemption of the people and the solution of the Jewish problem for the world. From now on Herzl not only convinced every audience he addressed by both the passion and the precision of his arguments; he also persuaded influential personalities in the political world of the soundness of his cause: the Duke of Baden, British statesmen like Chamberlain, Salisbury, and Lansdowne. Having no mandate except from a handful of Jews whom he himself had assembled, opposed and often derided by

all the Jewish wealth and power and respectability which in his time felt so much at ease in the Zion of its exile, he succeeded in laying the cause of his people personally before the King of Italy, the Pope, William II of Germany, the Grand Vizier and the Sultan of Turkey. The latter was willing to discuss only scattered colonization within his empire, but Lord Lansdowne, after unsuccessful negotiations in the Near East, offered Herzl a chartered territorial concession in British Uganda for the colonization of his people. Herzl had presided over the annual Zionist Congresses. The Uganda offer was presented to the congress of 1903 and rejected not only by it but by those Jewish masses of the East who were then the sharpest sufferers from the ills of exile. Herzl himself declared that he would never give up the Jewish claim to Palestine for territorial concessions elsewhere. But the controversy and strain told on his heart already enfeebled by his magnificent and unparalleled efforts and he died at a resort near Vienna on July 3, 1904.

To scrutinize the life and character of Herzl closely and objectively is to become ever more impressed by his greatness. He *was* just another Viennese *belletrist* of the second rank; he had many of the small foibles of his kind and class and period; he was a poor man who had, amid his efforts for his people, to fret over a decent livelihood for his wife and children. And this man, hampered from within and from without, compelled a world to accept his vision, achieved all the fundamentals of the liberation of his people upon which his successors could build and in nine years of storm and vision recreated Israel for itself and for mankind.

THEODOR HERZL

(1860-1904)

From THE JEWISH STATE

I

The Jewish Question

THE Jewish question exists. It would be folly to deny it. And it is a survival of the Middle Ages which even today and despite their best efforts the civilized peoples have not been able to solve. For they showed a definite magnanimity when they emancipated us. Nevertheless, the Jewish question exists wherever Jews live in noticeable numbers. Where it does not exist, it is introduced by Jewish immigrants. We naturally go where we are not persecuted; when we make our appearance persecution arises. That is true and must remain true even of very enlightened countries so long as the Jewish problem is not solved by political means. Poor Jewish immigrants are now carrying anti-Semitism to England, as they have already introduced it into America.

I believe that I understand anti-Semitism, in spite of the complicatedness of the phenomenon. I regard it as a Jew, but without hate or fear. I can discern in it the elements of brutal comedy, of vulgar economic envy, of inherited prejudice, of religious intolerance, but also the element of supposed self-defence. I consider the Jewish question neither a social nor a religious question, often as

it may appear in these guises. It is a national question. In order to solve it we must transform it into a political world problem to be regulated in the councils of the civilized peoples.

For we, too, are a people—*one* people.

We have everywhere made an honest effort to merge ourselves with the folk-community that surrounded us, and to preserve only the religious faith of our fathers. We are not permitted to succeed. In vain are we sincere and in certain countries even extravagant patriots; in vain do we make the same sacrifices of life and property as our fellow-countrymen; vain are our works in art and science by which we increase the glory of our countries, and vain the wealth we bring them through commerce and traffic. In our fatherlands, where we, too, have been dwelling for centuries we are proclaimed as strangers—often by those whose ancestors were not yet in the land when ours already suffered there. It is the majority that decides who is a stranger in the land and who is not. Hence the decision is made by brute force alone, like all things in the traffic among the peoples. When I say this on my mere personal authority I do not in the least intend to abandon the moral rights we have gained by our long residence. But in the world as it is today and will be for a time that none can measure, might is superior to right. In vain have we been good patriots everywhere, as were the Huguenots who were also forced to wander forth. And if one left us in peace . . .

But I do not believe that we will be left in peace.

Pressure and persecution are powerless to destroy us. No people in all history has endured such conflicts and such suffering. But persecution has never driven any but weaklings to apostasy. Whenever persecutions break out the strong Jews return defiantly to their people. The contrary situation could be well observed immediately after the emancipation. The more cultivated and wealthier Jews lost all feeling of Jewish solidarity. If political well-being endures at all we do assimilate everywhere—a thing in

itself not ignoble. Hence a statesman who desired the mixture of Jewish blood for his nation would have to guarantee our continuous political well-being. And not even a Bismarck can do that.

For deep in the soul of the folk are rooted the old, old prejudices against us. Whoever desires honestly to face this fact should listen to the common people expressing itself simply and sincerely. The fairy-tale and the folk-proverb are anti-Semitic. To be sure, the common people are childlike and can perhaps be educated. But this process would, even in the most favourable case, take such enormous spaces of time that we should have been driven long before to help ourselves by other means.

II

Things as They Are

No one will deny the misery of the Jewish people. In all countries where they live in considerable numbers they are persecuted more or less. The equality guaranteed them on the statute-books is abrogated in practice almost everywhere. Positions in the army or in public or private offices are inaccessible to them. There is a noticeable effort to force them out of business. "Don't buy of Jews!"

Attacks against us in parliaments and public meetings, in press and pulpit, as well as public interference, such as exclusion from hostelries and resorts, multiply daily. The character of persecution varies with the character of country and of class. . . . The shadings are innumerable. And I have no desire to cast up a plaintive reckoning of all our burdens. . . . It is farthest from my intention to try to touch anyone's heart. All such efforts are corrupt and vain and unworthy of us. I content myself with asking the Jews themselves: Is it true that in those countries where Jews live in considerable numbers the situation of Jewish lawyers, physicians, technicians, teachers, and employees

of every kind grows daily more unendurable? Is it true that the existence of our entire middle class is threatened? Is it true that the base passions of the mob are incited against our rich men, and is it equally true that our poor suffer more cruelly than any other proletariat?

The pressure is universal. Among our economic upper classes it causes moral discomfort; among the middle classes it is felt as a heavy, dull anxiety; among our poor it breeds naked despair.

The aim of the pressure is everywhere the same and may be summed up in the classical cry of the Berlin rowdies, "Jews, get out!"

I shall now formulate the Jewish problem in its tersest form: Must we get out now? And if so—whither? Or can we still stay? And if so, for how long?

Let us first answer the question: Can we stay? Can we, hoping for better times, practice patience and humility and wait until the powers and peoples of earth come to take a kindlier attitude toward us? I say that we cannot expect a reversal of the present stream of tendency. Why? The rulers, even were we as close to their hearts as other citizens, cannot protect us. Were they to show us too much benevolence, they would but strengthen the hands of our enemies. And the "too much" in this case would still be less than the ordinary claims of any other citizen, of any other component of the population. For the peoples among whom Jews live are without exception ashamed or shameless anti-Semites.

III

Modern Anti-Semitism

Let us speak no longer of the causes that are rooted in the human psyche, such as old prejudices or limitations of outlook. Let us speak of political and economic causes. For contemporary anti-Semitism is not to be confused with

the Jew hatred of former times despite the pseudo-religious colouring that still clings to it in certain countries. The chief trait of the modern movement against us is totally different in character. In the most anti-Semitic countries this movement is a result of our emancipation. When at last the civilized peoples realized the barbarism of the exceptional laws and liberated us, that liberation came too late. In our old dwelling-places we were no longer capable of being emancipated by legal fiat. We had, curiously enough, developed in the Ghetto into a middle-class people, and emerging from the Ghetto we were forced to become formidable competitors of the non-Jewish middle class. Thus the emancipation suddenly aligned us with the bourgeoisie and subjected us to two pressures, one from within, one from without. The Christian bourgeoisie would probably not object to sacrificing us to the Socialists; even that would help little. . . .

The pressure under which we live does not tend to improve us. In that respect we are quite as human as the rest of mankind. We do not, it is quite true, love our enemies. But none dare bring that reproach against us who has not conquered all human weakness within himself. The pressure put upon us generates in us an hostility against our oppressors, and that hostility in turn intensifies their oppression. Out of this vicious circle there is no issue.

"Ah, but there is," the gentle dreamers among us will reply. "Ah, but there must be. We must arouse the goodness in the hearts of men!"

Need I to stop to disprove this unrealistic sentimentality? Whoever would found a hope of better things on the goodness of men is indeed given over to utopian dreams.

I have already spoken of our assimilation. I do not for a moment say that I desire it. Our national personality is historically too illustrious and, despite all degradation, too noble to make its destruction desirable. But it is not impossible that we might be wholly absorbed by the surrounding populations if we were ever permitted to live in

peace for the full space of two generations. We never are. Brief periods of tolerance alternate regularly with periods of hostility. Any well-being of ours seems to infuriate that world which for centuries was accustomed to regard us as the poorest and most contemptible of the poor. And men are too ignorant and too narrow-minded to observe that prosperity weakens our Jewishness and tends to obliterate our peculiarities. But oppression presses us back to our old clan and the hatred in our environment makes strangers of us once more.

Thus we are and thus we remain, whether we will it or not, an historic group of recognizable homogeneity.

We are a people. Our foes weld us into one even without our will. It has been so throughout the course of history. Distress causes us to stand together, and suddenly we discover our strength. Yes, we have the strength to build a state, and a model state at that. We have all that is required—the human as well as the material means. . . .

IV

The State

In its fundamental form the plan for our state is infinitely simple and must be so, if it is to be understood by all people.

There should be given to us the *sovereignty* over a portion of the earth's surface adequate to our just needs and claims. All else we shall accomplish for ourselves.

The appearance of a new sovereignty is neither absurd nor impossible. In our own days we have seen such sovereign rights given to peoples who are poorer and less cultivated and hence feebler than ourselves. The governments of the lands most afflicted by the disease of anti-Semitism have the strongest motives for procuring us such sovereign status. . . .

The emigration of Jews from their homes in the dispersion cannot, of course, be conceived of as sudden. It will be a very gradual process and last for decades. First the poorest will go and make the land arable. According to a very definite anterior plan they will build roads and bridges and railroads and a telegraph system and regulate rivers and found their own homesteads. Their work will create the possibilities of human communication; these in their turn will create markets and the markets will draw new immigration into the land. Of their own free will men will then come at their own cost and risk. Our labor will enhance the value of the land and Jews will be quick to see that their spirit of enterprise, for which they have been hated and contemned, has at last found a new and durable field for its exercise. . . .

Our lowest economic strata will be followed to the land by those next above. Those who are nearest despair today will go first. Their leaders will be those mediocre intellectuals among us who are persecuted everywhere and of whom we have too many.

These pages of mine are written to make of this new Jewish exodus a world question. I do not mean that it is to be voted upon. That would make of it a lost cause at once. Whoever does not wish to join us may stay where he is. The opposition of individuals is a matter of indifference.

Whoever would join us, let him rally to our flag and fight for it by word both spoken and written, and by deed.

v

Fragments from the Diaries

A just historian may some day find that it was no small thing for a poor Jewish journalist in the day of the deepest degradation of his people and the most repulsive anti-Semitism to have made a banner of a rag, and of a con-

temptible mob a people that, with head erect, rallied about that banner. . . .

Zionism was the Sabbath of my life. . . .

My effectiveness as a leader is to be attributed to the fact that I who, as a man and a writer, have so many faults and have been guilty of so many errors and follies, have in this matter of Zionism been pure of heart and wholly without thought of self. . . .

I must myself make the very tools wherewith to fell the tree. The stone age of politics. . . .

The chief principle of my life:

Whoever would change men must change the conditions of their lives. . . .

My last instruction to the Jewish people:

Build your state in such fashion that the stranger will live happily in your midst. . . .

The poor Jewish people really has the most extraordinary ill-luck. A man like myself turns up who could really help them and fate makes of him a wage-slave who has to tremble for the bread of his children. . . .

I've found a pat inscription for my tombstone:

"He entertained too high an opinion of the Jews." . . .

Nordau said: "What precisely is the Jewish tragedy? That this most conservative of peoples that would ask nothing better than to cling to its own bit of earth has had no home on earth for two thousand years." . . .

The gentleman before me emphasized his French nationality. I said: "I had the impression that we belonged to the same nation. Else why were *you* shocked by the election of an anti-Semite in Austria, and why did *I* suffer when Captain Dreyfus was accused of high treason?" . . .

This is the most important difference between my influence and that of Baron Hirsch. People beg of him and do not love him. The beggars love me. Therefore I am the stronger. . . .

Rothschild refuses to have anything to do with our cause. . . . He considers my activities dangerous, as likely

to throw doubt on the patriotism of the Jews. . . . In view of which today's despatches are amusing. . . . In front of the very house on the Rue Lafitte from which my friend Nordau was turned away, the mob shouted last Sunday, "Down with the Jews!"

MAX NORDAU

Like Herzl, Nordau was a native of Buda-Pest (b. 1849). Medicine was his profession, but from his youth on he developed a huge and various literary activity. Novels and plays and journalistic work, now not unjustly forgotten, poured from his pen. In 1880 he took up his definitive residence in Paris and in the ensuing decade produced the two more or less sociological works which made his name familiar to readers in all languages: *Die konventionellen Lügen der Kulturmenschheit* (*The Conventional Lies of Civilization*) and *Entartung* (*Degeneration*). Great learning and acumen mark both of these books, but also the unhappy notion of the period that ultimate truth was to be had at once if only one let scientific notions bustle and whirl. Thus in *Degeneration* Nordau seemed to himself (and to the pseudo-scientific everywhere) to have disposed of some of the subtlest and most exquisite of modern poets by tagging them with the nomenclature of a (necessarily pre-Freudian) text-book of neurology. But since the application of any kind of intellectual energy (instead of terrors, evasions, and propitiatory gestures) when applied to the Jewish problem reveals the failure of the emancipation to emancipate the Jewish people and the futility and shamefulness of servile assimilationism as an instrumentality of adjustment, it is natural enough that Herzl's *Judenstaat* (1896) at once brought Dr. Nordau to his side. Though often engaged in sharp controversy with his fellow Zionists, Nordau remained a great figure and a vital force in the cause until his death in 1923. His specifically Zionist writings surpass his others in subtlety of insight and integrity of substance, as is well illustrated by the following pages from a pamphlet, *Die Tragödie der Assimilation*, published toward the very end of his impassioned and busy life.

MAX NORDAU

(1849-1923)

The Modern Crises in Jewish History

IT WAS toward the end of the eighteenth century that the critical moment of Jewish development approached. The enlightenment had either made breaches in or else totally destroyed the impenetrable walls that had hitherto separated Jews and Christians. Jews who were eager to acquire Western culture were admitted into the community of the cultured. The French Revolution went a step farther, a great and decisive step: it admitted the Jews of France to full citizenship and obliterated all difference in law between them and their fellow-countrymen. Until that day in history no one had ever raised a doubt concerning the existence of a Jewish people as such. All official documents that had to do with Jews, whether friendly or hostile in character, spoke invariably of "the Jewish nation" and the Jews themselves had never designated themselves otherwise than as a "nation" or a "people." The French Revolution did all in its power finally to dissolve that "Jewish nation" which, at least as a concept, had survived the destruction of the Jewish state by seventeen centuries. In establishing civic equality between Jews and other citizens the revolution severed the Jews with one determined blow from their past, which had hitherto been both their proud heritage and their grievous burden and made of these immemorial Palestinians Frenchmen of the day and hour who were to be reproached for their Asiatic origin no more than Bre-

tons with their British, Franks and Visigoths with their German, or Normans with their Scandinavian origin.

Through the gates of French revolutionary legislation the Western Jews entered into European life. They were no longer wandering strangers unwillingly endured nor guests on sufferance. They had a fatherland. They were established as citizens having full rights. They were being grafted upon the body of a mighty people and they far preferred this new politico-biological connexion to that natural and immemorial rootedness of theirs from which they were now being separated.

Sticking to a bad habit which the Jews had acquired in the past two thousand years, they neglected to look beyond the moment and to draw from their changed situation its logical consequences and conclusions. Not so Napoleon. He drew the conclusions from the idea of emancipation which they had failed to draw. He interpreted equality of rights in the sense that the Jews were to become Frenchmen without any reservation. Without any reservation—that is to say, without the wish or hope of any future change in their relations to the fatherland, without any ideal beyond that embodied in the French state, without the cultivation of any solidarity with their brethren beyond the French frontier, without the preservation of any dividing line between themselves and their Christian fellow-men, without even a secret, unadmitted desire for any separateness of being within the egalitarian nation.

Distrustfully and ruthlessly the great realist placed the Jews before the problem that they had not seen or not wanted to see and imperiously demanded an unequivocal solution. He summoned the Sanhedrin to Paris and among the clear questions which he put to it were these: No. 3. "May a Jewess marry a Christian and a Jew take a Christian wife, or does the Jewish law hold that Jews may marry only among themselves?" No. 4. "In the eyes of Jews are non-Jewish Frenchmen brothers or strangers?" No. 6. "Do Jews born in France and granted French citizenship regard

France as their fatherland? Are they obligated to defend it, to obey its laws, and to observe the regulations of the Civil Code?" The Sanhedrin had no difficulty in answering affirmatively the fourth and sixth questions not only with sincerity, but with joy. But Sinzheim, the president of the assembly who had to formulate the answers, was cruelly embarrassed by the third question. For it was this question that first revealed to the Sanhedrin the ultimate meaning and last significance of the French legislation. Men like Sinzheim understood well enough what was demanded of them and, cruelly tormented in their consciences, writhed as in a vise.

For what was demanded of them was that, for the sake of this new present they renounce both their past and their future. They were no more to remember that they had once stood at the foot of Sinai; they were no more to hope that a renewal of some greater destiny was in store for them. They were to cease to believe in the Messiah and to yearn for his coming. They had refused to acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah, and for this refusal had paid with eighteen centuries of hell on earth. Now they were asked to recognize in the French Revolution and in the French Empire the fulfilment of their Messianic hopes and hence to admit *either* that through eighteen hundred years of mystical ecstasy they had looked forward to this political event or else that they had been the dupes of a long delusion.

Now the Messianic hope is neither the ethical nor the metaphysical kernel of the Jewish religion. It is its historic core. Pluck it out and there remains a hollow husk which can be tricked out, according to temperament or personal preference, as either an indefinite theism of unitarian flavour or as an undogmatic mystically coloured spiritualism. Pious and learned Jews refused to admit to themselves that, according to the intention of the Christian law-givers, emancipation meant the uprooting of the Messianic hope from their hearts. They simply avoided a liv-

ing awareness of the significance of their civic rights. They consented to accept France as their eternal fatherland, to be Frenchmen and nothing but Frenchmen, and at the same time they continued in their prayers to implore the coming of the Messiah. . . .

In the course of the nineteenth century the example of France was followed by all civilized countries. Sooner or later everywhere, except in Tsarist Russia and Rumania, the native-born Jews were given a fatherland, and everywhere, whether openly or tacitly, the condition was made that this fatherland was to be considered as final and embraced without reservation, and that the new citizens were forbidden to indulge in any centrifugal tendencies or even dreams.

The mass of men is unreflective. That is true of the Jewish masses, too. They did not make clear to themselves the conditions they had accepted. After the many centuries of flight and wandering they were happy in the feeling of having solid ground under their feet at last. Immemorial custom persuaded them to observe their old holy days which all symbolize Jewish nationalism and all point to the old Palestinian homeland. They turned these observances into routine and did not think upon their meaning. Calmly enough they went on praying for the return to Jerusalem. But this did not trouble them, either, for they said their prayers more and more rarely, with less and less attention to their content as there spread more and more a calming ignorance of the Hebrew language in which the prayers were composed.

A minority of highly cultivated and ethically sensitive Jews could not so nimbly evade their difficulties. These people needed a firm relationship to life and to their world. They strove after sincerity and inner harmony, after a philosophy that might satisfy both mind and heart, that could be reconciled with logic and prevent a tragic conflict of ideals. They found various solutions of the problem, of which they grasped the high seriousness. The

most radical and frivolous chose the easiest way: they submitted to baptism. They apostasized. They accepted the ruling religion of the state. Tens of thousands of Jews, among them many of preëminent intellect, have chosen this path in the liberal countries during the course of the nineteenth century—this path to avoid which their fathers had preferred exile after exile and often death at the stake. Others disdained baptism as an act of insincerity toward themselves as well as toward their Christian fellows. They chose the attitude of religious indifferentism. . . . These were even more numerous than the out-and-out apostates. The jeer was just according to which Judaism had become a religious community consisting of atheists. The hope of this group was that their brand of enlightenment would make such rapid progress among Christians that they would soon be confounded with the great mass of free-thinkers of varied origins. A third group, finally, decided upon a policy of opportunism which was neither very heroic nor very engaging. These Jews condescended to remain Jews. But they harmonized their Judaism with their denial of every Messianic hope. They reformed it—that is, they replaced its venerable Oriental garb by a fashionable little coat of swanky cut. They turned their synagogue into a church without a cross and called it temple. They banned the Hebrew tongue, of which they were ignorant, from the prayer-book and expunged from the prayers any reference to the Messiah and to their own restoration. Consciously Reform Judaism broke with historic Judaism. . . .

Beside the apostates, the free-thinkers, and the reformers there arose a fourth movement which sought another means of philosophic reconciliation with the inherent Messianism of Judaism. The rabbis who represented this movement invented the famous theory of the mission of Israel. But even when I say that they invented it I am doing them too much honour. They simply took over a doctrine which the Christian Church had taught for many

centuries and impudently revalued it. What was that doctrine? That the Jewish people was condemned by Providence to be scattered over the earth in exile and degradation in order everywhere to be a living witness of the truth of the Scripture and its prophecies, and that it will not have expiated its sin until that end of days when the Saviour will reappear as Paraclete on earth and the last recalcitrants will accept Him and there will be but one flock and one shepherd. Let us see what the proclaimers of the idea of the mission of Israel taught. They taught that the Jewish people was destined by Providence to be scattered over the earth in order to be everywhere a living witness of the truth of the Scripture and its prophecies and that it will not have fulfilled its mission until the last recalcitrants will have accepted the One God and the necessity of brotherly love among all mankind and there will be but one flock and one shepherd. It is, you see, the identical doctrine, only that the words which symbolize judgments of value have been replaced by others. The Church says, condemned; the rabbis say, destined; the Church speaks of the expiation of guilt; the rabbis call it the fulfilment of the mission. . . .

In these various ways the self-sacrifice of historic Judaism was accomplished. The central idea that had created its solidarity for so many centuries was destroyed and the process of crumbling away set in. Only the Jewry of the East remained for a time untouched by this decay and constituted a national mass. Hence the Western Jews dissociated themselves emphatically from their Eastern brethren and affected to use the words "Polish Jew" as a term of abuse. As a reward for so much pliancy in a people so long considered stiff-necked these people expected the Christian world to drop all its old prejudices and to acknowledge them as real fellow-countrymen and true brethren. During one brief generation around the third quarter of the nineteenth century they seemed actually to have attained their goal. There were a few halcyon years,

roughly between 1860 and 1875, when there was apparently no Jewish problem in the West. Where the old hatred still glowed under the ashes, it was an object of pity and even of hilarity. The Jews looked upon it as a quaint survival, much as one might regard a belief in witches or in the devil.

The last quarter of the nineteenth century was marked by a sudden and castastrophic change. From one end of Europe to another there flared up a burning anti-Semitism unparalleled since the Middle Ages. With desperate amazement the Westerners of Jewish faith watched their Christian fellow-citizens as individuals and as social groups retract that equality which their political entity, the state, had conferred. Above all, Jews were once more denied the very capacity of patriotic feeling; once more they were called strangers and treated as such. And that was the sorest hurt that could be inflicted upon them. Zealously and even angrily had they denied the very existence of a Jewish people; they had violently denied any solidarity with Jewish foreigners; they had bartered away light-heartedly enough all hope of a national future for their people, all desire for one. And now they were strangers again. What cut them deepest was this, that the anti-Semites gave no quarter to Jewish free-thinkers or reformers or even apostates. If any class of Jews was handled a little less roughly, it was precisely the despised and mocked reactionary pious Jews with their nationalist feeling and their Messianic faith.

For a new principle was triumphing in the civilized world—the principle of nationalism. In the consciousness of precisely the cultivated classes it took the place that in former countries had been filled by religion. The feeling of solidarity necessary to men was now to be derived exclusively from their membership in the nation, and such membership was to be conditioned not by common loyalties or common speech and morals or common experiences and ideals, but exclusively by common descent and blood.

This exaggerated principle of nationalism transformed into insane theories of race betrayed the same exclusiveness and arrogance, the same fanaticism and hostility toward the outsider, that the religion of the Middle Ages had shown. Once more the Jews faced a wall that had no gate; once more they were felt to be strangers in their legal fatherlands by their legal fellow-citizens and were treated as such; once more they were morally expelled from Europe.

The effect of this radical change of attitude upon those Western Jewries among whom bonds had snapped or the beginnings of dissolution had set in was various. On the one hand it speeded up the movement of apostasy which had begun with the emancipation itself and led here and there to a mass flight in face of the enemy. On the other hand, it produced a curious volitional blindness of the soul. Many people asserted that they did not observe that anti-Semitism whose threatening fist was raised against them. Perhaps they did not, in fact, observe it. Still others assumed a noble pose of militancy and undertook brave campaigns against the anti-Semites which consisted in glorious complaints to ministers of state and other governmental personages whenever some trivial professor called a Jewish student a lazy kike or sheeny in front of the assembled class. And finally there were those who, on the homœopathic principle that like cures like, themselves became anti-Semites of the bitterest and most poisonous kind. Thus they thought themselves armoured against every hurt, since the Gentiles could inflict on them no affront or slander or shame which they had not already inflicted upon themselves.

But this new moral expulsion from their fatherlands and from European society had an effect of a far different kind upon one part of Western Jewry. It is but a small part as yet, but an important part, since it comprises that Jewish youth which unites character to intellect. Tens of thousands of young Jews of high culture and ideals have

returned to the great historic traditions of their people; they have revived within themselves the Jewish past and have awakened to a faith in the Jewish future as an incentive to vigorous action. With calm pride these young Jews accepted the principle of nationality and race without for a moment indulging in the grotesque exaggerations and insane implications of these principles, and so affirmed for themselves their own Jewish nationality and race. They joined the Jews of the East, in whom this consciousness of what they were had not first to be aroused by new persecutions, and determined upon a concentration and reconstruction of the Jewish people which desires, like happier peoples, to live its own national life and, living that life, to make its free and equal contribution to mankind.

The nineteenth century was the epoch of the decomposition of the Jewish people which, in exchange for its *apparent* acceptance into the European family of nations, was prepared to give up its past, its future, its very self. The twentieth century is heralded in as the epoch of the concentration of all the vital, of all the worthy elements of Jewry who are determined to carry on the history of their ancient people in conformity with its changeless ideals. And in this century we shall see whether the Jewish people will choose to die or to live.

I, for my part, am full of hope. The chief procurator of the Russian Church, Pobjedonoszeff, who was the most powerful man in Russia next to the Tsar for twenty years, explained one day how he envisaged the solution of the Jewish problem in Russia. One-third of the Jews in Russia, he said, would accept baptism and Russification, one-third would starve to death, and one-third would emigrate.

There may be an element of truth in this prophecy. During the twentieth century a part of the Jewish people may well disappear through apostasy, though I do not think it will be nearly a third; another part, while it will

probably not starve to death, may well be forced by misery into the proletarian revolutionary parties and merge with these to the utter forgetfulness of its character and origin. But a third part will arouse itself to a living Judaism of creative national action, and this part—both our friends and our foes may be assured—will be a noble and a worthy and a distinguished part of an ancient but rejuvenated people.

BERNARD LAZARE

Lazare, born at Nîmes in 1863 (cf. Preface) was fired from the beginning by the prophetic passion for justice. This led him in his youth to participation in philosophical anarchism, but even in earlier years he did not neglect the history and fate of his people and wrote a still useful and suggestive study of their persecution (*L'Antisémitisme: Son Histoire et ses Causes*, 1894). No sooner had he published this work in which he confidently predicted the passing of anti-Semitism with other mediæval fears and superstitions, than Alfred Dreyfus was accused of treason and a Jew once more made the scapegoat for the sins of others. The Dreyfus family entrusted the investigation of the case to Lazare, who from then on to his untimely death in 1903 devoted himself undividedly (adhering to the Zionist movement from 1897) to the cause of his people. An imperishable record of Bernard Lazare has been left by his friend, the eminent Christian stylist, mystic, and poet, Charles Péguy (*Notre jeunesse; Cahiers de la quinzaine*, 1910) and it is of the most profound significance how Péguy by knowing this one Jew was enabled to paint the portrait of the eternal practitioner of *Zeddaka*, of Jewish righteousness, in a characteristic modern embodiment. Péguy's *Le Portrait de Bernard Lazare*, a very great exemplar of his prose, runs to many pages. A few crucial passages may usefully be given here for the first time in English:

"The prophet in this great crisis of Israel and of the world, the Dreyfus case, was Bernard Lazare. . . . I shall draw the portrait of Bernard Lazare. He had, undeniably, the marks of a saint and of saintliness. And when I speak these words I shall not be accused of using them as mere

metaphors. He had a sweetness, a goodness, a mystic tenderness, an equableness of mood; he had experienced bitterness and ingratitude, but he had completely assimilated bitterness and ingratitude, for his goodness was of a kind which nothing could betray, a goodness perfectly instructed and aware of the world and so incredible in its depth. . . .

"He had a heart that bled in all the Ghettos of the world; and perhaps even more in the broken Ghettos, in the scattered Ghettos, such as Paris, than in the closed Ghettos, the barred Ghettos; a heart that bled in Rumania and in Turkey, in Russia and in Algeria and in Hungary; wherever the Jew is persecuted, and that is to say in a certain sense in the whole world; a heart that bled in the Orient and the Occident, in Islam and in Christendom and even in Judæa. Thus is the Jew. Rage shakes him. And it shakes him because a brother has been affronted in the valley of the Dnieper. . . .

"He had for the authority of this world, for the law from without, for government, for temporal force, for the state and all 'reasons of state' and for the gentlemen dressed in this little brief authority and swathed in these reasons, such hatred, such aversion, so constant a resentment, that that hatred of his annihilated them, so that they never entered, so that they were never honoured by being permitted to enter, his judgment. . . .

"He did not precisely want to return good for evil; he wanted supremely to return justice for injustice. . . .

"Never have I seen a man, I do not say believe, I say *know*, with such assurance not only that a human conscience is above all earthly jurisdictions, but that that conscience itself is and exercises in the world of reality a jurisdiction which is not only the supreme but the only jurisdiction. . . .

"Nor have I ever seen a man so burdened by a self-imposed burden, equally burdened by the load of an eternal responsibility. Even as we are and even as we

deeply feel ourselves to be responsible for our children, for our own children in our own household, even so and exactly as deeply and exactly in the same manner did he feel that the burden of his people was his responsibility. . . .”

BERNARD LAZARE

(1863-1903)

Notes on a Conversion

ONE day I awakened from a dream. I had lived among a certain people and thought myself to be of the same blood. I had been raised to rejoice in its joys and to sorrow in its sorrows. Its earth was mine and I had seen no sky more beautiful than the soft sky above it. I thought myself the brother of those about me and only on the day of my awakening did I hear it said that I was of another blood, another earth, another sky, another brotherhood. I awoke to find myself a Jew and I did not know what it was to be a Jew.

* * *

It was evening at a friend's house. The crowd in the streets was roaring, "Death to the Jews!" "It is always the same thing," said my friend. "Read any *Memorbuch* or the *Emek Ha-bacha*."

Said my friend: "You are not a Jew; you do not even know what that is, and yet you are persecuted as such. Make over your soul; then you will find in your soul the strength to bear what your ancestors, too, have borne."

* * *

The conception which Christians have of the Jew is a mystical and not a human conception.

* * *

Strange fate of the Jewish people! Even those who insult it aggrandize it and attribute to it a mysterious and all-powerful influence upon the march of events; and so Bossuet joins Drumont in making of Israel the pivot of the world's history.

* * *

What constitutes the Ghetto is not a free grouping, but an enforced segregation; it is the substitution of slavery for the free life within one's group.

* * *

The Hebrew language has a dozen verbs to express joy and joyous emotions.

* * *

Among the Jews the feeling of continuity replaces the hope of immortality. The sense of race is joined to that of the individual. Thus in the Jewish soul the reconciliation between individual interests and collective interests is accomplished.

* * *

For ages and ages the Jew has been demoralized by the Christian. It is the Christian who made him into a merchant and a usurer. It is the Christian who sought out the Jew to transact business for the growth of his cities, for the increase of his capital, for his own exploitations. He himself avoided all risks, since on the day of reckoning he threw the Jew to the angry mob and confiscated the Jew's possessions. He swallowed the whole profit. Next he drove the Jew out or had him massacred until it suited his purpose to have him come back.

* * *

"What would'st thou?" the monk asked Dante, entering his cloister. "*Pace*," answered Alighieri. That would be the answer of Israel, banished and fugitive like the poet. Peace,

the desire for *shalom*, it is still this that animates the soul of the Jew.

* * *

It is under oppression that there has come into being that soul of suffering Israel which was incarnated in Jesus.

* * *

O Jewish people, what part of the earth has not been moistened with your blood? To your misfortune, Christ was born of you and you became the Christ of the peoples, the outraged Christ, the thorn-crowned Christ, the Christ of the pierced side and of the cross, the Christ for ever insulted and stricken, to whom none even gives the sponge of vinegar. O martyr people, you are beautiful with the beauty of your secular sorrows!

* * *

The danger that menaces a people enslaved for ages is the danger of becoming exclusive. And yet how could the Jew have persisted if he had not taken refuge in his pride of race?

* * *

To be so detested by the whole race of man one must carry within oneself something truly great.

* * *

What rapture to create nobility out of one's very infamy and to build a kingdom on the rock of one's humiliation!

* * *

The Jew has not the concept of abstract sin. He knows sins, that is to say infractions of the divine law, but not abstract sin that engenders moral evil.

* * *

When the fusion of all the then existing superstitions

produced Christianity, the world awoke to find itself under the yoke of the priest, from which the Jew had liberated himself for ever.

* * *

Every Jew has his own system, his own notion of the world, his own economic and social theory, and, of course, his own method of solving the Jewish problem. He is a great constructor of doctrines, an impassioned idealist.

* * *

Anti-Semitism is a form of Christian hypocrisy. The Christian whitewashes himself by attributing his vices to the Jew.

* * *

It was not the Jewish people that crucified Christ. The common people followed that vagabond Pharisee and loved to hear him. Weeping, it accompanied him to the foot of the cross to which the Romans had nailed him and on which they had placed an inscription jeering at the Jews. But the Jewish people, who had loved and cherished the wandering revolutionary, refused to recognize in him that God which the Greeks and the Romans desired to impose on it and which has weighed on it with so heavy a weight.

* * *

I have now even conquered my pride in being a Jew. I know why I am a Jew, what attaches me to the past of my people, what allies me to their present, what obligates me to serve them and what permits me to demand their rights of the world.

* * *

The Jews have their own way of writing their history. A curiously apologetic way. They try to show that they are the nationals of the countries they inhabit and even more national than other citizens, and to be always proving

that they are not a state within the state. This is a general tendency among all minorities. The early Christians did the same thing in the Roman Empire; thus was invented the legend of rendering unto Cæsar what was Cæsar's.

* * *

He who has truly preserved among us the notion of a fatherland is none other than the poor Melamed of Russia, Galicia, or Poland who, early in the morning, his bare feet in slippers, sheds bitter tears over the fall of Jerusalem. It is the tears of the poor Melamed, the tears of humble believers who have preserved the idea of our country and have done more for it than those who proclaim it so emphatically today. If by any chance those were to disappear, the poor Melamed would remain.

* * *

So long as you will not give their own nationality to the Jews you owe them their full rights as men and citizens. You cannot maintain them in bondage and you will not liberate them among yourselves. Give them their country; meanwhile give them their rights.

* * *

Let us unceasingly demand for our oppressed brethren their human and civic rights, but let us show them at the same time that assimilation will not put an end to their wretchedness but is, on the contrary, the source of new misfortunes.

* * *

To be a Jew is the least difficult way of being truly human. It is for this reason that the Jew must remain a Jew.

ACHAD HA'AM

Achad Ha'Am (One from among the People) is the pseudonym adopted early in life by the philosopher and publicist, Asher Ginzberg, a thinker and Hebrew stylist of commanding importance in modern Jewish history. He was born of an excellent Chasidic family in Swira (Ukraine) in 1857 and received a traditional Jewish education. At seventeen he was a skilled Talmudist. Desirous of Western culture, he studied first in Odessa, later informally at the universities of Berlin, Vienna, and Brussels. The period marks the height of nineteenth-century positivism in its various aspects and shadings and within the larger circle of this positivism Achad Ha'Am remained to the end of his life. He tended, however, toward the idealistic wing and was influenced by the British thinkers from Hume to Mill rather than by the German extremists. Returning from the West to Odessa at twenty-nine he allied himself actively with the *Choveve Zion* and began his career with the memorable essay: *Lo se ha'derech!* (*Not This Is the Way!*). His essential point was, as he summed it up again many years later in the first collected edition of his essays, *Al parashat derachim* (*At the Crossroads*), that "the liberation of our spirit must precede our national liberation." Mind and heart of the Jewish people had been according to him, too corrupted and corroded by the exile to proceed to the rebuilding of the nation before an inner regeneration had taken place. In 1891 and again in 1893 he visited Palestine and was discouraged by the then barbarous and ruined state of the land. He wrote *Emet me'ereetz Yisrael* (*The Truth about the Land of Israel*) and declared that Palestine could never solve the Jewish problem, but that it could, as a cultural centre,

radiate its influence over all lands and effect the regeneration of the *Galuth*.

Needless to say that he was bitterly opposed by the political-minded Zionists who were, quite rightly from their point of view, more eager to save Jewish skins than Jewish souls. To this day the reproach of "mere Achad Ha'Amism" can be heard. The truth is that in ways he could not in those early years foresee and by methods from which his nineteenth-century positivism more or less excluded him, his ideal has prevailed. The achievements of our *Chaluziuth* (pioneer movement) in Palestine, which command the admiration of the most hostile observers, are the work of those who were first converted from the ills and vices and falsities of the exile, and the upbuilding of Palestine meets with difficulties whenever those engaged in it do not bring with them the ideological zeal of the redeemed. Moral revolution *has* preceded effective colonization.

He was, in any event, the first to give a philosophical basis to Jewish neo-nationalism. His precise theories concerning the "super-individualism" of the historically determined human group and the analogy between its regeneration and that of the individual need not detain us. Living reality has been more deeply affected by his demand that the Zionists be *Kohanim*, a group of priestly character and dedication. Nor did he, especially as time went on, detach himself from the practical work of the age on the universal basis. "The hostility against the Jewish people will last as long as that people is scattered among the nations, nor will any means be found to render it ineffective. That is the great 'news' which the Zionists have discovered and on which their whole system is built." Nor will it ever be forgotten that by the vigour, flexibility, and precision of his Hebrew style in writings extending over forty years he was among the very great recreators of that culture which, according to him, was to save his people. In 1922

he took up his definitive residence in Palestine. In a charming cottage on a street named after him in Tel-Aviv he passed his too few remaining years. He died in 1927 and lies worthily in the soil of the land he helped to recall to life.

ACHAD HA'AM

(1856-1927)

I

Outer Freedom and Inner Servitude

IF OUR brethren in the west of Europe were not fettered by their "rights," it would never occur to them to seek a mission or specific spiritual aims for their people, so long as that people has not achieved the natural material "mission" of every living organism—namely, the creation of such conditions of life as correspond to its psychical aptitudes and permit it the unimpeded development of such powers and abilities as conform to its nature. Not until a people has reached this condition can the hope arise that it will attain to a special aptitude in some specific province and thus prove its right to be in this specific matter the teacher of the other peoples and thus prove itself of use to the whole of mankind. If ever our people reaches that normal condition and philosophers were to come to me then and say: this particular matter constitutes the mission of our people for the sake of which it was created, I should still not share their belief, but I should not engage in a battle about what would be mere words. . . .

But when that day comes the grass will doubtless long have been growing over my bones. Today, however, while I am still alive I would like for at least a moment to turn away from the dreadful moral and material misery that surrounds me here in the east of Europe on all sides and I should like to get some consolation by gazing beyond our

boundaries to those lands where there exist Jewish professors, academicians, officers and dignitaries, and, alas, despite the decorations and titles, I seem to behold there a double inner servitude, a moral and an intellectual one. And so if some one were to ask me whether I envy these brethren of mine their "rights," I should answer in the negative with all possible decision and emphasis. Speak to me not of your rights! As for me, I enjoy no "rights," but neither have I sold myself in exchange for them. I can proclaim the fact that I love my Jewish brethren in all lands and in all polities and need not excuse this feeling by all sorts of wretched subterfuges; I am free to remember Jerusalem in other hours than those of official prayer; I may read the Lamentations in public without anyone daring to ask, "What is Zion to thee or thou to her?" Nor need I exalt my people to the skies and proclaim it the teacher of the other peoples in order to prove its right to exist. I know very well "why I remain a Jew." Or, rather, the question is empty of content to me as the question, why I remain the son of my father. I can also criticize in any way I choose the religious views that came to me from my fathers without fearing for a moment to destroy the bond that binds me to my people; I can even cling to the "scientific heresy" represented by the name of Darwin without jeopardizing my solidarity with the Jewish people. In brief, I am dependent on no one. I have to account to no one for my opinions or feelings but myself, and no consideration can force me to deny or conceal them in order to deceive others or myself. And I would not exchange this intellectual freedom—let any jeer who will—for all the "rights" in the world.

II

A Crumb of Comfort

Among all the hurts that we have recently been made to suffer, none wounds us so deeply and sorely as the accu-

sation of ritual murder. This monstrous calumny, though it is so old and has cropped up again and again, seems always new to us again and affects with undiminished force not only those upon the supposed scene of the deed, but all others everywhere to whom the rumour comes. If in the Middle Ages the whole of Jewry felt a profound solidarity with those unhappy victims whose lot it was to be the scapegoats for all; if everyone felt the whole burden of the accusations—it was because on each such occasion the entire community was in actual physical danger. And when, half a century ago, in the happy beginnings of civil equality, the ritual-murder charge of Damascus stirred up so deep an indignation, that was to be attributed to the enormous sensitiveness of the West European Jews in that honeymoon of the emancipation to anything touching their honour and their rights. But when in our own days, in which the physical danger except for those on the scene is no longer grave, and when we are also so accustomed to the slanders and accusations that hurtle down on us daily so that our blood is no longer stirred and our very feeling of honour dulled—when, in spite of these circumstances a tremor of indignation shakes us and a storm of rebellious protest breaks out everywhere, it is a proof that it is neither fear nor wounded honour, but that it is the very spirit of our people, which is conscious of the base affront and seeks to repel it because the sorest place in our hearts has been touched.

Yet every evil has something to teach us, and even this great evil of which we are speaking holds a valuable lesson. And we who are never the masters of our fate, but are subjected, whether we will or no, to both good and evil from without, shall we not at least draw from the evil that is inflicted on us a useful lesson and let reflection be to us at least a crumb of comfort?

One of the most important elements in the life of society is the so-called *consensus omnium*, or general agreement. Time was when even philosophers considered such agree-

ment a proof of the truth of its object and used the consensus of mankind as one of the proofs of the existence of God. Nowadays, to be sure, thinkers know very well that there is no falsehood or folly so crass but that it may, under circumstances favourable to it, be received as true by the universal mob. But only thinkers are aware of this circumstance; the common people still acknowledges no higher authority than a consensus of opinion. If all the world believes a thing it must be so, and even if I can't see how it can be so, yet everyone else does, and though I seem to *see* the contrary, yet all other men see the same object and see it differently, and who am I to set myself up against the whole world? That is not an unfair picture of what goes on in the mind of the common man. On the basis of such reflections he joins his own to the general opinion and thus becomes part of it.

Now this general consensus is so powerful that even he who is the object of it cannot escape its spell. If "all the world" asserts of some one that he is especially clever or devout or attributes to him other qualities whether good or evil, he will end by discovering these qualities within himself, even though, to begin with, he had no suspicion of their existence. The influence of this consensus of mankind does, in fact, go so far that it affects the character of its object and may gradually induce in him the development of those traits which "all the world" agrees in attributing to him. Hence pedagogues correctly warn us against calling children's attention to their faults at too early a stage or, above all, attributing imaginary faults to them, since the children are likely to be strengthened in the former and to acquire the latter.

It goes without saying that the opinion of "the world" is not the same for everyone. For a given person the "world" is only that social group to which he belongs and with the members of which he is allied. He is utterly careless of the opinion of alien groups. . . . Thence derives the fact that

the Jews, so long as they believed themselves literally to be the chosen people of God, were not influenced in their inner being by the opinions which the peoples entertained of them. They were conscious of their own worth and the general agreement of alien groups concerning them did not touch them at all; for those who "agreed" about them seemed to them so different in kind, so wholly alien to them, that there could be no question of relationship or comparison. Thus the Jew could listen with unshakable inner calm to an account of all the moral shortcomings and criminal acts which the opinion of an alien world attributed to him without any sense of shame or humiliation. He was careless of the fables invented by the *goyim*. If only they would leave him at peace.

In our own age this situation has changed. Our own "world" has enormously increased its dimensions and the consensus of European opinion influences us vitally in all aspects of existence. Since we no longer exclude the non-Jewish world from our interests we must necessarily be stricken by the fact that that world excludes us. A Russian writer propounded this naïve question the other day: "Since all the world hates the Jews, is it possible that the whole world can be wrong and the Jews right?" And this question has doubtless crept in this age into many a Jewish heart. Is it possible that all the ugly characteristics and the evil deeds which the world attributes to us are unmitigated delusion and slander?

Now so soon as a doubt of this kind insinuates itself it can easily be fortified by the mob mind's habit of false and facile generalization. This habit is wittily illustrated by the anecdote of the English tourist who, arriving at an hotel in Italy and being met by a waiter who stuttered, promptly wrote in his diary, "Italian waiters stutter." The mob will ascribe the qualities of an individual phenomenon to the whole *class* of objects to which in common speech that phenomenon belongs and never reflects that

a single object is capable of belonging to many simultaneous classification groups and may share one quality with the other objects in group A, to which it belongs, and a second quality with the objects in group B, and that the name it bears is significant of its relationship to but a single group and does not exhaust its relationships at all. The opinions of the mob are woven of such false conclusions, and these are applied to the Jews. Such and such persons are Jews, for instance, and are known to be cheats. Thence it is argued that all Jews are cheats. Now anyone capable of logical thought would at once object that, even if it were proven that all Jews are cheats, it would still not be proved that Jews were cheats *as such*, that their dishonesty is a Jewish trait and not perhaps one common to the mercantile class to which they belong. To get to the bottom of the matter it would be necessary to examine the ethical qualities of the non-Jews who belong to the same economic and vocational group. Not until that had been done would anyone be justified in assuming that mercantile dishonesty is a characteristic of the Jewish people as such.

The mob, of course, is incapable of such reflections. Our own masses, too, cannot be expected to entertain them. They are aware of the judgment passed by men upon them and observe that single individuals among them justify that judgment. This suffices to confuse them. And thus "Jewish characteristics" become the common coin of opinion and are passed on from others to our own people, with this difference, of course, that while the others recount the tale of our evil traits with loud aplomb and ugly joy in our discomfiture, our own people recount the common slanders with repressed shame and humble devices of self-justification. The peoples compare us to an earthen vessel that must be shattered; we think of ourselves in the likeness of an iron pot that may again and again be cleansed through fire. . . .

This condition, if it endures, can inflict a severe moral

injury on us. Nothing is more dangerous, either for an individual or for a people, than to confess to sins of which one is innocent. For he who has really committed a sin can repent and cleanse himself. But how shall he do so who has been persuaded by others to believe in his own degradation? On the one hand, he cannot withdraw his soul from that "consensus of opinion" which attributes certain vices to him; on the other hand, he cannot free himself of these vices since they are in fact imaginary. . . . A confusion of this kind can go so far as to create in given individuals the faults that are supposed to be theirs because they are asserted of their people, though they themselves had not the least natural inclination toward them. There is no doubt, for instance—to take but a single instance—that among a people that brought forth Maimonides there must be men now whose vision is sane and clear, who have a love of order and logic, and who, were they engaged in public life, would display these qualities and influence their fellow-workers by them. But what is to be done in view of the fact that it has been generally decided to attribute lack of system to us and that we have tacitly given our agreement? It is very questionable, by the way, whether lack of system, which is in fact a broadly Jewish failing, is not to be debited to the category of *Cheder*-pupils rather than to that of the Jewish people as such. Those among us, at all events, who have organizatory talent are enfeebled by the initial doubt of their ability to fight against a deep-rooted characteristic of their people; if, above all, men of this type are Jewish patriots they will seek to tear from their hearts their native love of order, since this is *said* not to belong to our national character, to which they will seek to conform. . . .

For all these reasons there should be sought a means to free us from the spell of that false consensus of opinion concerning our characteristics and our supposed moral inferiority, in order that we may not become contemptible in our own eyes, persuading ourselves that we are less

worthy than other men, and finally run the danger of really embracing those imaginary failings.

This means exists. It consists of the consensus of human opinion that has from time to time and in place after place sustained the charge of ritual murder. For this charge is one concerning which even the universal opinion of mankind could not affect us for a moment. In this matter we know that the lie is a lie and that, though the whole world were to be against us, the world would be wrong and we alone in the right. For every Jew knows that in the entire Jewish people there is not one, not a single individual Jew, who ever even conceived the notion of using human blood for religious purposes. The whole world's wrongness and our rightness concerning ourselves is brilliantly illustrated by this example, which we should do well to imprint upon our minds in order, by the analogy of it, to withdraw ourselves from the spell of other accusations. Let the world assert of us what it will. We know that these assertions are based on vulgar errors. For who has ever sought to penetrate into the soul of the Jew and to observe him as he really is? Or who has ever compared Jews with non-Jews belonging to the same category, or subject to the same sufferings; who, that is to say, has compared fairly Jewish and non-Jewish merchants or the oppressed or the hungry of both kinds? Who has ever done so and seen the scale incline to either side?

"Is it possible, then, that the whole world is in the wrong and we alone in the right?"

It is possible; it is so. The charge of ritual murder proves it. Are not the Jews of a perfect innocence in this matter? A Jew and blood? Can one imagine a contradiction more violent? And yet . . .¹

1892

¹ The immense pertinence of this extract is, to the shame of humanity, illustrated by the May, 1934, number of *Der Stürmer*, edited in Nürnberg by Julius Streicher—a special "Ritual Murder Number" devoted to a revival of the old accusation.—THE EDITOR.

National Ethics

Whoever is skilled in the history of ethics knows that the development of morals depends on many factors and does not always follow a single line. The concrete details will be found in such books as Lecky's *History of European Morals*. Here the observation may suffice that, although there are a few fundamental moral principles that are agreed upon by all civilized peoples, yet each people possesses an ethical vision of its own which conforms both to its psychological structure and to its historic experience. Thus there may be moral obligations or breaches of morality which count heavily in the eyes of a certain people which exacts much of itself in this respect, while another people will take these matters lightly and consider them of small import. Not only in respect of the values attached to various moral phenomena, but in the very character of the discrimination between good and evil do we find wide divergencies among the peoples: the thing that seems good to one people seems evil to another and what seems to one a duty worthy of any sacrifice seems to another an indifferent thing. Between such extremes, moreover, there is room for many subtle shadings which are not even perceptible to superficial observation. The peculiar character and needs of each people, its material and spiritual conditions, the historic experiences through which it has passed—all these factors condition the special form of its relationship to the sum of things and so, naturally, to its ethical views and their practical realisation.

Now the ethic of a people, that is to say, its special way of differentiating good from evil in all the intricacies of personal and social life, this is perhaps more than any other cultural phenomenon a specific national conquest, testifying to the life of that people and to its condition in all ages, setting in high relief the value of its national

spirit and the nature of its relation to the surrounding world and its shifting conditions. And if this be true of all the other civilized peoples, which are, after all, not so sharply differentiated from each other in their specific characters, their conditions and historic experiences, how much more deeply true must it be of the Jewish people "a people dwelling apart" from its very origin. This people, separated from all the other peoples by the character of its development and its extraordinary fortunes, from time immemorial on, must quite assuredly possess its specific national ethos, or morality, founded upon the peculiarity of its psychical structure, upon its historic past, and upon its present condition and needs.

Once we face this fact it becomes evident that the question of our national duties assumes a new form. The nationalists may excuse their negative attitude to the national religion by the plea that, since faith cannot be willed, it cannot be made the basis of the people's life. But so soon as we have reached the conviction that in the vestiture of religion there is hidden the most important phenomenon of our national life, namely our folk ethos, which springs directly from the spirit of the people and its historic life—have we not the right to demand of all the nationalist leaders that they seek to recognize our true national ethos and strive to harmonize life therewith?

There is no dispute concerning the fact, for instance, that knowledge and use of the national language is one of the best means of fortifying the national feeling in the hearts of the people, even though it would be difficult to define with any precision those traits of the national spirit which are expressed in the language of a given people. Scholars have sought to fix these traits in various languages and have not succeeded beyond finding a very general and indefinite relation between the language and the spiritual formation of a people. Yet it is beyond doubt that whenever we point to language as a means of identification with the national spirit, we do so on the basis of the following

conclusion: The formation and development of a language is conditioned by the spirit of the people, and as every creator impregnates the thing created with his being or as, according to Chasidic teaching, "the power of the worker is in the work"—thus every language necessarily contains something of the special qualities of the spirit from which it sprang, and though we may be unable to define this truth mathematically, we cannot deny that the use of the national language must approach the heart to the national spirit. If this be true of the language of a people, it is true in a higher degree of that people's ethos. For in the end language is but, as it were, the mirrored image of life and of spiritual becoming, whereas ethics represent the direct relationship between the spirit and the world of reality. And if a man is accustomed to harmonize all of life with the foundations of his people's ethics, even though he does so at first as an artifice and an outer command to be fulfilled, yet he will end by feeling the living source and inner spirit from which the ethos of his people springs and he will finally know this relationship to be part of the national cause that he now too embodies.

A concrete example or two may now be far more useful than further abstract explanation. Many people, especially Zionists, have no doubt already made the following odd observation: The two writers who are generally acknowledged to be the leaders of the Zionist movement, Herzl and Nordau, have each recently published a Jewish play. First Herzl published his "New Ghetto," and the other day Nordau his "Dr. Kohn." The tendency of the two plays is all but identical. Both protagonists are Jews wholly identified with the German spirit. When they see that all their efforts will not force the Germans to consider them German, they return to their own people. And both protagonists, Herzl's Dr. Samuel and Nordau's Dr. Kohn, die in a duel in which they engage in order to save their "honour," that is, to prevent their German friends from characterizing as cowards those Jews who "bear af-

fronts without recourse to the sword." Herzl's hero, to be sure, is a man whose mental processes are not made wholly clear to us or to himself, and we do not know quite what he wants or means or what his direction is when before his death he exclaims: "Away from the Ghetto!" Nordau's Dr. Kohn is a much cleverer man who observes clear-sightedly and gives himself an honest account of all his views and actions. He does not hesitate clearly and openly to declare that he belongs not to the German but to the Jewish people. When he is asked how it is possible for a people to be such without land or language, he answers at once, and with a spontaneity that bears witness to long reflection, "We will seek to conquer a land for ourselves and we must recover our forgotten language." Thus it appears that Dr. Kohn is not only a nationalist Jew, but, in fact, a Zionist, although he does not utter the name of Zion. And yet this Zionist challenges a German officer, a heartless *Junker*, because the latter says: "I regard you as a coward and assure you of my especial contempt."

I need not explain how thoroughly this action runs counter to the very foundations of our national ethics, not only as expressed in the commandments of our religion but as embodied in that ethical sensibility that lives in every Jewish heart. The European peoples in their totality—admitting all possible exceptions among thinkers and writers—are still under the spell of the vulgar notion that an affront offered us by others must be wiped out in blood. The genuine Jew, whose heart vibrates to the ethos of his people, on the other hand, recognizes instinctively and profoundly, that a millennial culture raises him far above such savage vestiges of barbarous and cruel ages; his feeling of honour is not touched nor diminished by the vulgarity of ruffians. His answer to such is a glance of contempt and the calm pursuit of his path.

Now why does not this Dr. Kohn, nationalist and Zionist, feel more Jewishly? It might be explained as follows: during an hour of decision he reverts to the mental habits

of his youth when he was not yet a Jewish nationalist, and under the influence of anger he falls into error, forgets his duty as a Jew and is thus impelled "to commit a sin into which has entered the spirit of folly." Dr. Kohn, however, declares to his betrothed, who implores him to forgive the insult, that he would gladly do so for her sake, but that he has no right to do so *because he is a Jew*. "The incident will be talked about and people will generalize, as they always do. One will pass judgment not on me, Leo Kohn, an individual, but on all Jews, on a whole people. The shame which I do not repudiate will blacken my whole race. Thence arises my duty." And when his betrothed replies reproachfully, "Then your race is dearer to you than I," he answers, "I can adore you without betraying my people." And he adds that "every Jew must constantly keep in mind that the enemy's hatred forces him at all times to bear the burden of representing an entire people." And it never seems to enter the man's mind that this people, whose representative he holds himself to be and for whose honour he thinks he must die, has wholly different notions concerning the value of life and the nature of true honour, and that he betrays his people and diminishes its honour not by refraining to risk his life for a vulgar trifle, but by committing that barbaric and horrible deed. Through it he has wounded the honour of his people's spirit and ethos which should have been far dearer and more sacred to him than that mere *seeming* in the eyes of the Gentile world for which he throws his life away.

What, then, is this Dr. Kohn? A political Zionist? Doubtless. But is he a national Jew? Can a man be such whose spirit is so alienated from that of his people that in the hour in which he thinks he is faithfully fulfilling his moral duty toward that people he is wholly guided by the moral sensibilities of an alien folk and sacrifices his life to *them* without a moment's suspicion of the fact that he is sinning against the very soul of his own people in whose name he

speaks. Truly, the guilt is not his. He himself asks: "What are we? Training and education rob us of our Jewish soul, and the German soul that the world seeks to substitute is given no chance to live." He adds the final words, "The Jew must become *himself* again. That is his only salvation. . . . As a Jew he must seek to become a complete human being." But how can he become a whole human being as a Jew so long as he does not seek to return and to let a Jewish soul come to true life within him, so that it is this soul which directs him upon his path and inspires the activities of his will?

The example I have adduced is crude enough. Reality furnishes far subtler and more intricate problems, which it would take long meditation and great effort to solve. Our national ethics have become so tightly interwoven with religious considerations that it is often hard to disentangle the threads and to draw the proper line between questions of religious and ethical development. Also there are elements in the situation which cannot be considered as the results of individual human development, because they have nothing to do with the fundamental spirit of our ethnic morals, but are alien growths due to accidental external causes. Nor must we forget that the immediate needs of our people, springing from its present situation, have an important influence on this problem and intensify its difficulty. Thus, for instance, Nordau's Dr. Kohn was brought to face all his problems first because he had fallen in love with a German girl and wanted to marry her. He explains to the girl's father his conviction of Jewish nationalism and, of course, emphasizes the fact that his principles are not opposed to mixed marriages. Let us assume that this is possible, that the spirit of Jewish ethics is in itself not opposed to marriages of this kind—yet does there not arise the very difficult question whether in our present state of dispersion and disharmony such marriages do not constitute a danger to the integrity and persistence of Israel? And if this be so, is it not the duty of the Jewish

nationalist to sacrifice his personal preferences to the integrity of his people?

In brief, Jewish national ethics constitute a great body of teachings which need to be both studied and lived. . . . Hence the most creditable thing that our nationalists could do would be to form societies for research into our ethnic morality in order that they may discover their true duties and embody these in their lives.

AARON DAVID GORDON

The life and teaching of this sage and saint will some day reach beyond the limits of one people and one language—the Jewish people and the Hebrew language—and (unless the apparently Dark Age that is approaching is without term) help to rebuild a human world. He was born in a Podolian village in 1856 and lived the life of an average lower-middle-class Jew. For the greater part of his mature manhood he was a functionary of Baron Ginzburg and supported his aging parents and his wife and children. He brooded upon all the problems of the people and gradually in his free time developed an intense and wholly unofficial pedagogical activity, insisting, among other things, on the equal instruction of girls and boys. He was allied with the *Chovev Zion* movement and was deeply shaken by the discovery of the writings and theories of Achad Ha'Am. But his own thinking went much deeper. It went to the very sources of man's moral nature. He made no announcement, however, declared no theory, since it was a fundamental part of his thinking (immemorially Jewish, by the way) that doctrine must be declared by being *lived*.

At last, when he was forty-eight years old, he saw small ways and means of temporarily providing for the surviving members of his family and set out to Palestine alone. There, having been a "white-collar" worker all his life, he hired himself out as an agricultural laborer now in one and now in another of the old colonies (Petach-Tikvah, Rishon l'Zion) and lived the lore he was later to announce. He dreamed of an *Am-Adam* a deeply human earth-folk (*adamah*=earth) which through creative labor on its native and historic soil would reach to cosmic feeling and in its

relation to other peoples be not otherwise than one good man is in his relations to other good men. His first demand for the redemption of the Jewish people was that Jews should go to *Eretz Israel* and through intensive bodily labor on their own soil relearn that lost fundamental work of every people on its own soil under its own stars from which demonstrably all the living cultures have grown, from which grew the antique culture of Israel, from which, therefore, the rebirth of that culture must also grow. He knew the necessity for organization; he was the ideological originator of those groups of comrades who founded the *Kvutzoth* (communes) that have reclaimed the waste places of Palestine and literally made the desert to bloom. Upon his ideology was founded the *Hapo'el Haza'ir*, the Young Workers' Party, but he was undeviatingly opposed, though an uncompromising laborite, to all the Western forms of socialism because (1) they neglected the eternally natural productive state of man: living on his own soil with his own folk in spiritually creative oneness and (2) because with their ready-made mechanized theories they left out the individual and his regeneration. And only (according to Gordon) from new men can a new order grow. He demanded the *Kiddush Ha'Adam*, the sanctification, the redemption unto productivity and good of every individual human being, if from the grouping of human beings a new and better way of life was to arise. In smaller and in greater ways history in the few years since Gordon's death has overwhelmingly justified his theories. It has justified them in smaller ways by the admirable success, both practical and cultural, of those colonies in Palestine founded according to his teachings, like that exquisite colony of Daganiah to which he himself retired to die among his comrades in 1922; it has justified them in terms of world-historic tragedy by the boundless cruelties and exterminations of the Soviet régime (paralleled in modern history only by those of the National-Socialist régime in Germany)

which prove forevermore (if Jews and Christians *needed* such proof) that the old Adam cannot in the eternal nature of things found a *new* order. He writes Utopia on paper and practises the cruelties and vices that were immemorial when Babylon was young.

AARON DAVID GORDON

(1856-1922)

I

Work and Culture

A PEOPLE wholly detached from nature, imprisoned in walls during thousands of years, such a people, inured to all phases of life except that ultimately natural one of spontaneous work for its own sake, cannot become once more a living, natural, and labouring people without the extreme exertion of its total will. We lack the one thing needful—work. Not compulsory work, but that work with which such a being as man is organically and naturally integrated and through which, in turn, a people is integrated with its earth and that culture which is rooted in the soil and in work. It is true that among other peoples, too, all individuals do not work productively, that many disdain work and seek ways of living by the labour of others. But a truly living people unfolds its activity in a wholly natural way; its work constitutes one of its organic functions and is executed in accordance with its nature. To the majority of any living people work is second nature. It is not so among us. We really disdain work and even the workers among us labour in the constant hope of some day exchanging work for a comfortable life. We must not deceive ourselves; we must come to see clearly how unhappy is our condition in this respect, how estranged our spirit, both individual and national, has become from work. Quite

characteristic is the saying, "So long as Israel does God's will, others will work for us." For it is not a mere saying. Consciously or not, this thought has become almost an instinct and almost second nature among us.

Let us now assume that a dense Jewish settlement were to come into being, would this situation change at once? Will a change come over the substance of our soul without some radical healing? Will not our Jews continue to prefer mercantile pursuits, peddling, financial transactions, all the callings in which others work and they assume direction? And even if life were to force a part of them to actual labour, will these people not again choose such urban pursuits as offer the possibilities of attaining wealth and leisure, if they do not, in fact, emigrate to other and wealthier lands? Under these circumstances the land would again be cultivated by others and the essential and organic labour performed by them. Can such be the natural state of a living folk?

Who is there that meditates concerning this matter? Who feels it profoundly? We have no *work* and no one feels the lack. And we seem not even to feel it when we discuss our national rebirth. We feel the lack of work neither in its aspect of that force which marries man to earth and lets him truly possess it, nor as the chief source from which a creative national culture must arise. We have no land, no living speech or culture—so much at least we feel and seem more or less to recognize, and we seek to do what is necessary or what is possible. Yet if no one among us truly works, what will all else avail us? Let Ivan, John, Mustapha do the work. *We* will create culture, produce national values, and seek to bring about the reign of absolute justice on earth.

Now what is the character of this "culture" which after long and stubborn conflicts has finally been agreed upon within our movement?

It consists in what, among us, is known as a requicken-
ing of the spirit. But this spirit which we want to bring

back to life is in itself no living spirit; it neither penetrates nor quickens the body nor does it draw life from the body; it is quite abstract, and its glory is to be found only in the innermost cells of the brain. In brief, this whole culture is nothing but a group of opinions. And when it is a question of mere opinions or views, one individual can select those of Hermann Struck or the Rabbi of Lida, and another those of Marx and Engels.

Under such barren aspects are we accustomed to regard culture and even to speak of its reflowering in the dispersion. "Spirit" and "opinions"—such things take up no room in space and it is hard to say whether they are either in harmony with the time or genuinely rooted in the folk. But the truth is that in the diaspora we can have no living culture which must be nourished by life itself and develop from it. And the reason is this, that in the diaspora we have no *life* of our own; the life that we live in the diaspora is not *our* life. What we have in the diaspora are certain inherited cultural goods which at need we have refashioned according to the spirit of the time and land in which we are. We have had, that is, to bring them in harmony with the life which the will of *others* forces us to live and with the wind of the spirit that blows in the world of those others. In the *Galuth* we have developed thus an adaptability to remold the products of an alien life according to our spirit and to fashion of the fruit of alien work tidbits that suit our taste. Beyond that we have nothing but the knowledge and conviction that we possess a huge *minus*. In this unnatural condition our only real sharing of civilization is in the realms of ideas, literature, poetry. Here we have produced much that is new and have even exhibited some creative ability. But that does not suffice for a living culture.

A living culture embraces the whole of life. Everything that life creates for life's necessities, *that* is culture—digging the earth, building houses and roads; such work, such labour, such activity is culture, or, rather, the basis and

substance of culture. The order and manner and way according to which these things are done produce the *form* of a national culture. All that the workers feel and do and experience working or resting, and the relations which arise the while with that nature which is alive in each—this it is that creates civilization. From this the highest culture—science, art, philosophy, poetry, ethics, religion—draws its nourishment. These high and sublimated aspects of culture which alone those have in mind who speak of culture among us are only the cream at the top of a national culture in the widest sense. But can he produce cream who has no milk? Or is it possible to skim one's own cream from a stranger's milk?

What is it that we seek in Palestine, if not just this thing that we have nowhere else—the living milk of culture? What we need today in our great poverty is not an academic culture, but a culture of life itself, in the cells and atoms of which that academic culture is embedded—a culture of life itself which, given time and conditions, will gather at its top, to keep our simile, the natural cream of its higher manifestations. We need to create the philosophy of life as well as its art, its poetry, its ethics, its religion. Nor must we forget to build a bridge of life, a living bridge, between our present and our past. Living we need to create our own life, conformable to our spirit and our kind. And at this point I must add a few words to make the matter even clearer, though it should be clear enough even so. We are the children of God who created the universe by the word of His mouth. And when I speak of “creating” I mean to make the strict comparison and to say that by heeding a simple word we can create what we need. Therefore the matter may be formulated quite simply thus: All that we desire in Palestine comes to this, that we create with our own hands all that constitutes life; that with our own hands we perform all the work and labour that is needed from the highest and most complicated and easiest down to the coarsest and hardest and

most contemptible, and that we thus come to feel and think and experience all that labouring human beings in the performance of all these varied tasks can come to feel and think and experience. Only when we do that will we possess a culture because only thus will we have a life of our own.

But among us it is possible that people come together from all the lands of the dispersion and even from Palestine and take council concerning what must be done for our rebirth and our redemption and that we talk about a living culture without its occurring to anyone to speak of the ultimate foundation of all culture, of the essential thing that we lack—namely, work.

1911

II

On Rebirth in the Dispersion

What do we mean by working for our national rebirth in the diaspora?

It is the same work as in *Eretz Israel*, only in another form. In the lands of the dispersion our work for *Eretz Israel* is pioneering work: the preparation of our settlers and the acquisition of the means for a continuous resettlement in *Eretz Israel*. But there is also a work to be done for the rebirth of our people in the lands of the exile, and this, too, is pioneering work, though not directly for *Eretz Israel*. It, too, means the requickening of mind and body by bodily labour, especially labour on the land and close to nature; it means the revivifying of our national being and ways of knowing and thinking and creating; it means striving for the rebirth of the Hebrew language in word and thought.

The idea must be grasped in its totality.

The fact that we were torn from our natural earth in *Eretz Israel* and were dispersed and enslaved and perse-

cuted, has separated us from nature and from all natural ways of life and all productive work and has turned us into a parasitic people robbed of the very possibility of drawing directly from nature the sustenance needed by both the body and the soul. We are stunted physically and materially, no less in our economic than in our spiritual life. In the course of our long life in the dispersion our national spirit has been nourished only by the remains of our past and by the crumbs fallen from alien tables. The garment of our spirit is in tatters and has been patched from strangers' cloth.

Now that we are striving after a rebirth, national and human and personal, too, we must heal these ills and recreate our lives. We must return to nature and to our own work and speech. And the first object of our striving must be to return to our own land and take root in the soil of *Eretz Israel* through our labour and to requicken our national language. But we cannot transport the entire people at once to Palestine and no man knows how many years or generations it will take or if it can ever quite come to pass. And hence we must deeply consider how our people in the dispersion is to come back to life, and we shall find the means the same as in *Eretz Israel*: the return to nature, to work and to our national speech. That part of the people that takes root in *Eretz Israel* must send forth a stream of new life and winds of healing over the *Galuth* lands, but from those lands to *Eretz Israel*, too, there must go the spirit of our will and our devotion. There must be a reciprocal influence and a reciprocal quickening.

It has been said that if the Jews in the countries of the dispersion experience a rebirth through work, a so-called social rebirth, then they will be admitted into the group-life of the peoples among whom they dwell and will be thralls of the ideals and creative activities of those peoples and thus become more easily assimilated.

Such observations illustrate clearly the confusions of

thought that arise when one mistakes national rebirth for a mere social process of renewal and unites things utterly disparate, namely, nationalism and socialism. In order to prevent any possibility of misinterpretation, it should be said at once, though, strictly speaking, it should go without saying, that to oppose nationalism to socialism in our sense is not for a moment to negate those ideals of economic and social justice for which socialism stands. The distinction to be made is between the *kinds* of groups within which those ideals are to be realized, whether within a national group or within a class-group, and also between the kinds of *means* whereby those ideals are to be realized. Now after what has here been said it is clear that the ideal in question can be realized only through the form of the nation—not, to be sure, of a jingo nation, but of a truly humane one—the *Am-Adam*, the man or brother-folk.

In a merely socialistic renewal the community life lacks the foundation of the family, nor can this lack be made up by harnessing together the two alien forces of nationalism and socialism. And there is likewise lacking the cosmic element, which is the soul of a community. For wherever a community or group does not possess those national characteristics that stamp it with a group-personality and enable it to create a group-life, wherever it is an accidental association, there the cosmic principle, the soul of a community, cannot exist. It is no accident that the socialist movement and doctrine originated in cities and factories wholly alienated from nature, whereas nationalism stems immediately from the world of nature.

Now we are striving to return to our own life and to our own creativeness. A nation can do that only by drawing strength from the very sources of its own life and its own nature; nor can the individual member of a nation attain to a life and a productivity truly his own, if his nation which gives his human soul a characteristic form, is alienated from its proper life and productivity.

Now that nature which bore us and is ours is the nature

of *Eretz Israel*. It stamped its seal so firmly on us that the trace of it cannot be obliterated so long as we have a spark of our own life within us. This peculiar character or stamp of ours is so powerful that it resists all influences of other environments so long as it is free and active and permitted to assimilate what it receives from without. The obliteration of our national *form*, which includes that of the individual form of every member of the folk, the two being inseparable—it is this that threatens us in the lands of our dispersion so long as these are merely *Galuth* lands to us, so long as we are merely recipients of the effects of a life not ours and are merely influenced by the creativity of others and have not the possibility of assimilating that only which we can recreate according to our character, nor have the power to possess that which is wholly ours and are estranged from the sources of our own being and our own productive activity. Therefore it is not strange that the Jews in *Galuth* are prone to embrace ideals that do not bear the stamp of a living national character or of which the national character is easily dimmed. Among these ideals is that of the socialists or, rather, the ideal of social justice in its doctrinaire party form. It is not by accident that socialism is nearer the hearts of so many of our young people than nationalism, and not by accident are socialists more numerous among us than among other peoples. This does not argue a deeper understanding of justice or greater passion for it. A humane nationalism possesses these no less. It argues the lack of a deep sense of one's own character and an estrangement from the sources of one's own life and being. In this condition of passiveness in which we have no life of our own nor even seek it socialism can betray us into a hopeless waste. But so soon as we come to realize the pressure which the spirit of others exerts upon our own and reach out after a cognition of what our own national and individual character demands, and especially so soon as we begin to seek a path toward our own rebirth and our own redemption and

then to tread that path—from that moment on neither the life of the other peoples nor its ideals or tendencies or intellectual currents can menace or misguide us any more. For from that moment on and in the exact measure in which our knowledge and appreciation of our own character and its needs spreads and deepens among us and leads us to progressive work for the rebirth of *Eretz Israel*—from that moment on and in that exact proportion the lands in which our people lives dispersed cease to be *Galuth* and become simply countries in which some of our people live away from their own even as groups among the other peoples live in other than their ancestral homelands. Then the Jews who live in those lands will no longer be the mere objects of alien forces, but they themselves will exert their due influence upon civilization and they will do so not alone with what they have received from others and reworked with their intelligence and their imagination, but they will be giving of their own, goods that are the fruits of their own being, in proportion to the vital and creative power that exists among their men of intellect and thought and talent. From which it follows that if we desire to weaken the assimilatory movement we dare not diminish the human content of the lives of the Jews of the dispersion and thus let them once more become the mere objects of the civilizatory processes. We must, on the contrary, seek means by which to widen and deepen the human element in its Jewish form in their lives in order to enhance their power of self-originating productivity. Nor will this turn the hearts of those dwelling in *Galuth* away from *Eretz Israel*. Rather will it intensify the need of the more spiritual-minded among them to live in *Eretz Israel* where our true life and its creative character first came into existence.

Thus and thus only can there spring forth sources of reciprocal blessing not only between those of our people who dwell in *Eretz Israel* and those who dwell in the

other lands, but also between the people Israel and its fellow-peoples.

It is now nearly nineteen hundred years that we have been living in nearly all the lands of earth amid its peoples, and yet we have acquired little or nothing from them that has the value of the highest human good, such an one, that is to say, as enlarges and deepens and enriches our own spirit in such a measure that out of our own native wealth we can make a perfect return and recompense for it. We have been alienated from nature in the lands of our dwelling and have denied ourselves to it and have learned nothing of it. The peoples have by force kept us estranged from them and we have not learned to understand them nor taught them to understand us. Now that we are about to create the world anew for us we must gain access to nature itself in all lands and seek to conquer and acquire it from within and to absorb all its power to influence and mould us from which hitherto we have withdrawn ourselves. If we do that we shall also come to understand the peoples with a deeper and more human understanding and that will be a blessing both to them and to us.

In brief, in order to reëducate the Jew and bring him truly to life again, it is necessary to begin with the foundation—with the human being. It is the human being within the Jew which is to be brought back to wholeness and to life in the fullest and deepest sense of the concept human being within which the concept Jew is included for him. For the Jew cannot be an integrated human being without being an integrated Jew. The assimilationist errs in his notion that he is more a human being in proportion as he is less a Jew. Precisely the contrary is true: he is less human in exact proportion in which he is less a Jew. For such a thing as an abstract human being simply does not exist, but only Russians and Germans and Englishmen and other kinds of men. Hence if a Jew goes about destroying the Jewish element within him, he does not replace

it by an abstract human element, seeing there is no such thing, but by a Russian element in Russia and a German element in Germany and an English element in England and America, a national element, in other words, that is not natural to him. And so instead of being a good and authentic Jewish human being he becomes a second-rate and unauthentic Russian or German or Englishman. It is no cogent reply that there are very gifted assimilationists, for who can tell how much they would gain in wealth of essential being, in spiritual depth and elevation, in immediacy and originality, if they had developed instead of destroying the Jewish element within themselves. Thus the Jew in us withers, because the human element in us is withered and we can enlarge and elevate our humanity only by a return to nature and to work.

It is clear, then, that in the lands of the diaspora, too, Jews must strive toward nature and toward productive work and come to desire the creation of their own life by and for themselves. Work in all of its forms, but above all work on the land, the utter refusal to exploit the labour of others, economic life on a coöperative basis and an inner life on the basis of the family—this is what we must demand in the lands of our exile, too. In them no less than in *Eretz Israel* there is room for *Kvuzoth* and *Moshvei ovdim*. All our efforts must be directed to the single end of our release from the shame of parasitism and alienation from nature and to our return to nature and to work.

We have, moreover, both the right and the duty to demand of the peoples in whose midst we live, and especially in so far as they themselves strive after a renewal of human values and after more humane relations both among individuals and among peoples, that they give us or, rather, give back to us the opportunity of living by our own productive work, above all, by agricultural work. We must make this demand of the League of Nations; we must make this demand of every parliament that our voice can reach.

But our thinking, too, and indeed every creation of our spirit, must be wholly ours, stamped by our own seal, born of our inherent form in our own Hebrew language. For it is hardly necessary to explain how great is the power of speech in moulding a people's thinking and how profoundly it affects all productive activity. And this will be especially true of those who seek to requicken the Hebrew language in order that it may become the language both of our daily lives and of our thinking, and thus deepen all self-originating processes in the Jewish soul, reveal unsuspected paths of both the intellectual and the spiritual life and increase the living power of self-knowledge and unborrowed perceptivity.

Hence in the lands of the exile no less than in *Eretz Israel* we must strain every nerve to make of the Hebrew language the living speech of the Jews both for social life and for the life of the mind. If we truly desire the rebirth of our people, wherever be its dwelling-place, we shall find our language to be the strongest living bond between our people in *Eretz Israel* and in other parts of the world, as well as the strongest safeguard against assimilation. . . .

It may well be asked whether it lies within the realm of possibility that our people in the dispersion can rearise as a working and productive people with its ancient speech reborn upon its tongue. The realities before us vouchsafe no answer and the cold reason will be inclined to make a negative reply. But in matters pertaining to life and its creative processes immediate feeling and moral conviction may well be given their weight. Immediately contemplating the Jews of the diaspora, we answer: yes, it is possible. It will, of course, take two or three or even four generations. It will be difficult, perhaps unimaginably so. But a point will be reached at which that which we desire will be seen to have shifted from the realm of the impossible to that of the possible. Is not that the nature of every process that has to do with the original and creative forces of life itself, that it hovers on the boundary line between the

impossible and the possible until the ripe creative fact is suddenly seen to lie within the latter province?

By what practical measures are these plans to be embodied in reality?

Specific methods will have to be adapted to the local conditions of each country. What must be clear to all is that the execution of our task calls for a pioneering effort, a fundamentally creative and national effort and work, the like of which we have never known. We shall meet unheard-of difficulties. But we shall be inspired by an equally incomparable strength and by a spirit that both uplifts and quickens.

In all the lands of the diaspora there must be called into existence a pioneering movement which has as its aim bodily labour, above all agricultural labour, and the use of Hebrew as the language of every day—a great and general movement, especially among our youth, not alone for work in *Eretz Israel*, but in the lands themselves. From this movement a steady stream will flow to *Eretz Israel*; but those who must stay in exile will become pioneers of work on the land and of spoken Hebrew there. The chief thing is that all must work and all must learn Hebrew, especially the young people.

This will be especially difficult in the beginning. Aside from the inherent difficulties there will be the hardship which any individual feels in becoming an exception. It is hard to oppose public opinion in one's environment and to face the public attitude toward anyone who leaves the well-trodden paths. Thus anyone who, belonging to a class that lives without bodily labour, determines henceforth to subsist by the work of his hands, is regarded as descending from a higher to a lower social level and is treated accordingly. So, too, anyone who in the diaspora strives to make Hebrew the language of his daily life will be publicly regarded as either freak or fool. As in all such cases fearless individuals will have to make the beginning. But it is almost needless to say that the courage needed will

bring its rich rewards; it will be heightened and strengthened in proportion as he who exercises it sinks in public esteem. But this situation will be brief; public opinion will soon give the pioneers the honour that is their due. Moreover, the pioneering efforts can be much eased by the association of individuals into clubs and organizations. These, beginning with small circles of people, will be gradually enlarged and the movement will spread from the centre toward an ever-growing periphery; it will be a living and unanswerable movement, which all will have to reckon with and by which more and more men will be upborne and inspired. . . .

It is in some such fashion that I imagine the work for our rebirth in the dispersion. Let no one fear that this work will impinge on our efforts for *Eretz Israel*. For whatever comes or goes we shall be obliged to work for the creation of a living present for our people in exile. And this work must be work for a true rebirth and not one that permits the sources of corruption to endure.

Finally, those who truly desire the rebirth of our people in all the lands of earth will find this path to their work and will come of themselves to know what is needful to be done. Life and labour will be their teachers. The chief thing is the strong will to do this work, to travel toward this goal of a profoundly genuine national and human rebirth.

1921

MARTIN BUBER

Dr. Buber is the most distinguished and influential of living Jewish thinkers. Grandson of Salomo Buber of Lemberg (Lwow), an eminent and prolific scholar in the midrashic field, born in Vienna, he unites the venerable traditions of the East with the entire wealth of Western literary and philosophical culture. But that is not all. Martin Buber happens to be an artist. No one not wholly blinded by a political neurosis would deny that he belongs to the very thin front rank of living German masters of prose. Now a really great stylist speaks with the absolute authority of his creative power. Thus, for instance, technical criticism of his retelling of the Chasidic legends is irrelevant, is beside the point. These legends will remain a permanent possession of mankind in the form he has given them by virtue of that form which has itself become a part of their message and meaning. Thus, too, his re-interpretation of the Jewish past is beyond the arbitrament of factual scholarship; it has the permanence of great artistic *vision*; it has recreated that past in the soul of the present and is *itself* an enduring part of Jewish reality. This is not to say that Dr. Buber is not a first-rate scholar in the strictest sense; his *Königtum Gottes* (*The Kingdom of God*, 1932) opens a new era of Biblical criticism. The point is that his authority derives from a higher and another, namely a creative and prophetically poetic, source. We are all his pupils. The contemporary reintegration of modern Western Jewish writers, thinkers, scientists, with their people, is unthinkable without the work and voice of Martin Buber.

He was born in 1878, studied at various universities, and almost at once (as editor of *Die Welt* as early as 1901)

took an active part in the Zionist movement. From 1906 to 1916 he lived in Berlin. He then took up his definitive residence at Heppenheim a.d. Bergstrasse near Frankfurt a.M. Here from 1916 to 1924 he edited the monthly magazine *Der Jude*, the most distinguished Jewish periodical in any European language; from 1923 to the catastrophe of 1933 he occupied the chair of Jewish religion and ethics at the university of Frankfurt, heard and venerated not only among his own people, but by all those Christian contemporaries who thirsted for a new and acceptable interpretation of the permanent elements of religious truth.

It is not easy within a brief compass to adumbrate the chief ideas and commanding vision concentrated in his central book *Discourses Concerning Judaism* (*Reden über das Judentum*. Collected edition 1923) and the less systematic essays and addresses collected in the two volumes of *Die jüdische Bewegung* (*The Jewish Movement*, 1920) and the magnificent *Kampf um Israel* (*Israel Embattled*, 1933). It must suffice here to say that Buber has sought to disengage the specific spiritual and intellectual character, content, and trend of Israel as a people and a community and to clarify and set into belief the permanent elements of that character, content, and trend, so that the intellectual young Jew of this age, asking: what is it within me that admittedly is my own and which, to live a truly human life, I must affirm and not only affirm, but *live*? receives an answer so profound and persuasive, so corresponding to his inner needs and so conformable to his soul, that he feels himself to be within Israel and Israel to be within him. In view of this undoubted fact it will seem meagre and barren to say that Buber finds throughout Jewish history the compelling notions of Unity, of the Realization of the divine on earth through the deed, through action, and the idea of the "absolute future" within the life of humanity. Perhaps it is more helpful to say that he has recreated for us the metaphysical reality of the Jewish people (such a metaphysical and transcendent life and

reality as every people has) as an object of our devotion and of our intellectual life within which we can love and affirm (without excusing or condoning) the shabbiest of empirical Jews, precisely as no Dane, let us say, or Englishman lives less by and through his people and his people's culture and meaning because courts of law and prisons are necessary for certain Danes and certain Englishmen. But the difference is this, that no intelligent or sensitive Englishman need take thought concerning this matter, for from life and landscape, from education and reading, the metaphysical realities of Englishness are the constant contents of his experience, while the modern Westernized Jew hungering and thirsting for that same experience had no visible and tangible content for it. This Jewish experiencing of Jewishness is what Buber has made possible and has provided not only through his original works but through the anthological works and the translations of Jewish legend, literature, philosophy, and vision that he has inspired, from the magnificent *Der Born Judas* (*The Well of Juda*, 6 vols. 3rd. ed. 1924), by M. J. bin Gorion, to *Mission and Fate, a Jewish Reader* (*Sendung und Schicksal*, 1931) and his own and the late Franz Rosenzweig's incomparable translation of the Torah, Prophets, and Writings. All these works and many others were accomplished under the influence not only of Buber's philosophic and ethical vision, but of his art, so that by a tragic irony this body of Jewish literature represents a level of stylistic accomplishment exceedingly rare in German writing.

It may be added that the present volume is a modest attempt to begin to do for English-speaking Jewry what Buber and his colleagues and disciples have so magnificently done for the Jewries of German speech.

MARTIN BUBER

I

The Meaning

THE question which I propose to you and to myself today is the question concerning the meaning of their Jewishness to the Jews.

Why do we call ourselves Jews? Because we are Jews? What does that mean, precisely? I do not wish to speak to you of an abstraction today, but of your own lives, of our own lives. And not of outer act or involvement, but of inner justification and being.

Why do we call ourselves Jews? Is it only because our fathers did so? Is it only a matter of ancestral habit? Or do we call ourselves Jews out of the core of some living reality?

Out of ancestral habit? Tradition may represent the highest freedom to those who reëmbodify it clear-mindedly and significantly; it is wretched slavery to those who make a mere habit of it, because they are both stubborn and slothful of mind. What meaning is there in this that has been handed down to us as name, principle, command—Judaism? To what kind of a human community do we bear witness when we call ourselves Jews? What means this journey of ours through the abyss? Shall we fall into oblivion through the mist of the millennia or does some primal force bear us onward to a fulfilment? What does it mean that we will to persist, not only as human beings,

human spirit and human seed, but in defiance of the ages, in defiance of time itself—as Jews?

In the great storehouse of concepts there lie ready to hand all sorts of dignified and obedient answers for those clever people who have no taste for making life harder than it is by penetrating to the innermost nature of any problem. There are such answers to our question no less, and the names of two of them are Religion and Nationality. To our vision these answers are but questions masquerading as answers.

Is there such a thing as a Jewish religion?

I repeat: I do not ask after the outer forms of life, but after an inner reality. It is the inner reality that alone determines the measure of meaning that Judaism has to the Jews.

Does there exist a Jewish religiousness utterly real as such? Not dogma or norm, cult or rule. Does there exist today a specific relationship to the absolute, actually embodied in human lives, which by virtue of its special character may be called Jewish and is visibly constituted by and objectified in the Jewish group?

Once we know there existed a Jewish religion in this sense. The age in which Jacob wrestled with his God for a blessing, and the age which imagined the death of Moshe under God's kiss and the age of primitive Christianity which dared to elevate the perfected man into the Son of God, and the later age of Chasidism which had the temerity to forge the fate of God on earth through the communion and coöperation with men—these ages possessed a Jewish religion. But our age? Where among Jews is there a passion for the Divine that drives them forth from the narrow purposes of society into a truer life, into a life that bears witness to God, that transforms him from a "truth" to a reality because it is lived "in His Name"? I do not say that none bear witness in our time; no, some bear witness out of loyalty and some out of pride and some out of inner sloth, even as the stone, dropping through space,

bears witness to its direction. But where is there fulfilment today? Where is there a community of which the activating principle is neither Jewish tenacity (known as "tradition") nor Jewish adaptability (the well-known "purified"—i.e., emasculated Judaism, a humanitarianism of monotheistic leaning), but an immediate Jewish religiousness, an elementary passion for the divine, the sacred searing power of the Elohim? Who embodies today the unconditioned, the meaning of Yahveh?

By the test of inner reality the Jewish religion is a memory; perhaps it is also a hope; it is no present reality.

And the second answer to our question affirms the Jews to be a nation. Undoubtedly they are a nation. Even as, according to the test of form there exists a Jewish religion, so by the test of its effect there exists a Jewish nationality. It manifests itself in the life of the Jews among the peoples. But we are not asking after the outward effect, but after the inner reality of Judaism and Jewishness in the life of Jewry. How does its national existence manifest itself there? The relation of the Jew through suffering or reaction to the non-Jewish world, all that that world inflicted upon him as a Jew and the effects of this infliction on himself—such things may have coöperated in his formation during seventy generations without furnishing one fundamental element on which his inner Jewishness is built. For could they do so, he would no longer be a Jew by virtue of his own character and substance, but a Jew out of mere stubbornness and at the behest of the nations whose gesture could reduce his Jewishness to the mere memoried tracery of suffering, like the lines which years and fate leave upon the human countenance. There must exist more than that; there must be an autonomous reality. But what is it that makes his people an autonomous reality in a man's soul and life? What is it that causes him to apprehend his people not only about him but within him?

The individual adult repeats on a higher plane a process which every child undergoes. The child experiences first

its environment and discovers its "I" gradually; gradually it learns to differentiate its own body as a separate thing from the mass of phenomena. This stage of the orientation of perception repeats its rhythm in the later orientation of the individual mind. The adult experiences first the shifting impressions and influences that constitute the world of his environment and only later discovers the experiencing substance of his permanent self.

Originally the individual finds himself in a cosmos constituted by his impressions; to this the "I" lends no more than an emotional colouring. This cosmos is made up for him of two separate spheres which define themselves to him with the utmost precision and clarity: one, homeland, earth, sky in their familiar peculiarity; two, the human milieu which includes him, communicates itself to him and permits his participation in the two fundamental forms of companionship and speech, and of action and *mores*. The feeling of solidarity that binds the individual to a group larger than the primally given one of the family or the chosen one of his friends, is grounded in these constant elements of experience: homeland, speech, *mores*. He feels a sense of belonging to and with them who share with him these constant elements of experience and regards them in their totality as his people.

Many remain merely at this point. We are concerned with contemplating him who takes a further step. What leads him to take that step is the innate aspiration, blunted in many but growing and ripening in others, after permanence, durable substance, immortal being. Such an one discovers that there exist not only constant forms of experience, but also a constant experiencing being that is the bearer of all the concrete forms of being. As the child discovers the I-ness of its bodily being, so does he discover last the I-ness of his spirit as that which is constant amid the shifting shows of life.

Discovering its body, the child discovered its limitation in space; the man, discovering his unique spirit, perceives

his illimitedness in time. For his desire after permanence leads his vision to go beyond the span of his individual life. This is the period of youth marked by emotions broad-winged, eloquent, and yet shy which never return with equal power even when maturity gives them ideational form: immortality of the soul or of force, of work and of deed. This youth, touched by the awe of eternity, discovers within himself the fact that permanence exists. And he discovers this in an even more naked and mysterious fashion, with that simplicity and wonder that clothe the commonplace when once we stop truly to contemplate it, in the hour in which there is revealed to him the enchainment of the generations and he *sees* the line of fathers and mothers that has issued in him and becomes aware of all the meetings of men and women and all the interpenetrations of blood with blood that have brought him forth and of all the spherical rhythms of begettings and of births that have called him into being. In this immortality of the generations he feels the community of the blood and perceives that community as the prior life of his own self, as the permanence of that self in the unending past. Fortified by this feeling, he proceeds to the discovery of the blood as the root-like and nourishing force in the individual, to the discovery that the deepest strata of our being are determined by the blood and that it colours the core of all our thinking and willing. Now he both feels and perceives this: the environment is the world of impressions and influences; the blood is the substance that receives these impressions and influences which it absorbs into its content and reshapes according to its form. And now he no longer feels that he belongs to the group who possess in common with him the same constant elements of outer experience; he experiences his own profound solidarity with those made of the same inner substance as himself. Once he arrived at the feeling of solidarity from without; now he arrives at it from within. On his former level his people symbolized the world; now it symbolizes

the soul. Now his people is to him a community of men and women who were, who are, who will be, a community of the dead, the living, and the unborn who together represent a oneness—the precise oneness which he perceives to be the groundwork of his “I,” of that “I” which was destined from all eternity to be *this* necessary link in the long chain of being. And all that the men and women who form this chain have created in the past or will create in the future—it is *this* that he now knows to be the work and creation of his innermost and unique character and all that they have experienced or will experience he knows to be the very substance of his fate. The past of his people is his personal memory; the future of his people is his personal task; the *way* of his people teaches him to understand and to will to become his true self.

II

Of Oneness

It is a fundamental fact of psychical dynamics that the manifoldness of the soul is constantly perceived by man as a dualism. Since in fact consciousness does not differentiate between appearance and reality it may be said that the soul tends constantly to assume a dualistic form. Man, in brief, experiences the fullness of inner realities and possibilities as a substance that tends toward two opposite poles; he experiences his inner way as a pilgrimage from crossroads to crossroads. The two poles or contradictories which attract the soul may change content and name; the decision at the crossroads of choice may be perceived as a personal decision or as a necessity imposed from without or even as accident. The pattern remains the same. And this pattern is one of the decisive ultimates of human life; it is perhaps the most essential of all, since it bodies forth the mystery of the original twofold nature of the psyche which determines its nature and meaning. Now this pat-

tern or fundamental form is in no human type so powerful a determinant or so central as in the Jew both of the past and of the present. In no other type has it assumed a reality so pure and so complete nor affected so decisively both character and fate. Nowhere else has this determinant created anything so extraordinary or paradoxical or heroic or in the nature of a marvel as the striving of the Jew after unity. And it is this striving after unity that makes of Judaism a human phenomenon and makes the Jewish problem to be a problem of all mankind.

This is neither the place nor the moment to explain the origin or development of this extreme consciousness of duality in Judaism. But whoever knows how to interpret history will not fail to find it again and again from the earliest records on to the present day. Its most powerful expression in the primordial period is the myth of the fall of man as it was incorporated in the book of Genesis. This myth, of which the autochthonous character is not denied even by the pan-Babylonians, establishes the elements of good and of evil, the clearest and most telling of all the contents of man's inner duality, with consummate power and clearness. It represents man's task as being in the nature of a choice, of a decision, and represents the whole future as dependent upon this decision. It speaks for man who is torn between the poles of a dualism. Let us not be deceived into thinking the dualism of the ancient Persians at all analogous to this. Persian dualism has reference to the objective world, not to the world of the soul. It is cosmological, not psychological. Persian dualism is a description of reality, not a confession of guilt. According to it man *is* divided even as the cosmos is. According to the antique Jew the world was not divided, nor was man divided. No, man separated himself; he fell and failed and became unlike the Divine. The world as object remained homogeneous, and Satan a servant of the Lord. It is the soul that is riven in two, and the world only so far as it is a symbol of the soul. . . .

I have taken the classical example of the myth of the

fall of man and cannot stop to analyse others. But open the great record of Jewish antiquity wherever you please; read in the historical books the tales of the apostasy from Yahveh or read in the prophetic books the call to the conquest of injustice, or in Job the expression of insight into the necessity of inner dualism, which the pure will cannot master nor he who fights for his integrity escape, but only redemption can lead him forth from it; or hear in the Psalms the ever-returning cry for cleansing through God—and in all these passages you will find the experience of inner division and everywhere the striving after oneness.

The striving after oneness. After oneness in the soul of the individual. After oneness between faction and faction of a people, between people and people, between humanity and all other living things. Between God and the world.

And this God Himself had come forth out of that striving after oneness, out of that dark, impassioned striving after oneness. He had been evoked not from nature, but from the soul of man. The believing Jew “asked not concerning the heavens or the earth, if he had but Him,” because he had brought Him forth not from reality, but from his own yearning, because he had not seen Him in heaven or on earth, but had conceived Him as the Oneness above his own duality and as the salvation of his own suffering spirit. The believing Jew (and the believing Jew was the Jew entire of nature) found his integrity in his God; through Him he took his redeeming flight into that primordial childlike mythic age of undivided being in which, as Job says, “God’s mystery was above my hut”; through Him he fled into the Messianic future of reintegration, of wholeness; in Him he was redeemed from all duality.

For just as the idea of inner twoness is a Jewish idea, so is the idea of redemption therefrom Jewish. The Hindu idea of redemption is doubtless purer and more absolute; but its goal is not redemption from the duality of the soul but from all implication with the world. The Hindu redemption means an awakening, the Jewish a conversion;

the one aims after liberation from illusion, the other a grasping of truth; thus the one is a negation and the other an affirmation; the Brahmin floats into the "intense inane"; the Jew seeks the pathway of humanity. Like all historical ideas, the Jewish idea is less sharply definable but far more stirring. It speaks through Job's "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and in the Psalmist's "Create a new spirit within me." In it no less was rooted the idea of redemption of the Jew Jesus. And when Jewish mysticism altered the original character of the idea of God and carried a dualistic notion into the very conception of Him, then the Jewish notion of redemption rose to the heights of the Indic itself: it became the idea of the redemption of God Himself through the reuniting of the God-being, far removed from the world of things, with the God-glory or emanation which wanders, exiled, in that phenomenal world; it became the idea of the redemption of God through his creature: By each soul's rising from its twoness to oneness, by each soul's growing to be at one within itself, God reattains His Oneness.

It is the striving after unity that has rendered the Jew creative. Struggling out of the division of the "I" after oneness, he created the idea of the God Who is One; striving after unity out of the cleavage in twain of human society, he created the idea of universal justice; seeking to bring union out of the division of all living things, he created the idea of universal love; striving to unify a riven world, he created the Messianic ideal, which a far later age, largely under the guidance of Jews, dwarfed and trivialized and called socialism.

III

Ultimate Aims

In order to comprehend what the fundamental change which I am advocating could effect, it is necessary to recall

to ourselves the nature of that profound Judaism of which we desire the rebirth. You touch only the coarsest externals of organizational form when you speak of it as a religious persuasion; you touch a deeper reality when you speak of a folk and its ways. But it is necessary to peer still deeper in order to discover its innermost character.

Judaism is an intellectual and spiritual process which manifests itself in the inner history of the Jewish people and in the works of its great representatives. To identify this process, as both Lazarus and Achad Ha'Am do (each in his own language), with the doctrine of unity or the spirit of the Prophets is still to limit it unduly. The doctrine of unity is but a single element, and the spirit of the Prophets but a single stage in that great process which is to be called Judaism. And only he who grasps this process in all its magnitude, in all the fullness of its constituent elements and in the manifold transformations of its revelation through history, can comprehend the significance of that which I call renewal here.

The spiritual process of Judaism effectuates itself historically as the striving after an ever more perfect realization (embodiment in concrete vital terms) of three interdependent ideas: The idea of Unity, the idea of Action, the idea of the Future. When I speak of ideas I do not, evidently, mean abstract concepts, but natural tendencies in the national character, which manifest themselves so powerfully and so enduringly as to produce that complex or web of spiritual works and values which may be fairly pronounced to be the *absolute life of the people Israel*.

Now every people of strong specific gifts has similar tendencies peculiar to itself and a whole world of works and values which are the creative expressions of these tendencies, so that it may be said to live a twofold life—the one fugitive and relative in the succession of its mortal days, in the arising and fading of its generations, the other life (strictly simultaneous with the first) an abiding and

absolute life in the world of the wandering and seeking spirit of man. And though in that first or relative living all things seem accidental and often desperately meaningless, yet are there revealed in that other or absolute life, with more and more of clearness, the great and radiant lines of both meaning and necessity.

The relative life of a people remains the possession of its folk-consciousness; its absolute life enters immediately or mediately into the consciousness of mankind. But there is none among the peoples of earth in which this constant begetting of an absolute life, in which the characteristic spiritual process of its nationality is so visible and so strongly marked as in the Jewish people. In its relative life, in that aspect even which is commonly called history, as well as in the common day of every present, there is the confusion of finite purpose and haste and desire and pain. But from this confusion arise evermore, radiant and magnificent, the eternal aims and write their indestructible signs across the heaven of the abiding. And to the eye that penetrates through the relative to the absolute life of our people, it is revealed that the former with all its busy confusion exists only to beget the latter and that the latter is the ultimate reality and the former only the many-coloured, manifold and fugitive appearance. The proof of this can be tested more clearly and unequivocally in the life of the Jewish people than in any other way, and it is for this reason that I dared to call Judaism a spiritual process.

IV

The True Foundation

And so it came to pass in the nineteenth century, when the emancipation led the Jews to the peak of a high mountain and showed them all the kingdoms of earth and the splendours thereof, that the fences about Jewish life and

law were broken down and trodden under *not* by some elemental force of renewed creativeness, but by the pale and feeble efforts of the reformers who borrowed both thought and form from the text-books of European enlightenment and of the so-called progressive religions. We are the problematic heirs of these attempts to shake to its foundation the old Oriental structure of Judaism and to leave no ground for any rebuilding.

And yet that ground exists and lasts unshakably. It is the groundwork of the Jewish soul itself. For the Jew has remained an Oriental. He was driven forth from his own land and dispersed over the lands of the West; he dwelt under a sky which his heart knew not and on a soil which he could not dig; he suffered martyrdom and that which is worse than martyrdom, a life of degradation. The *mores* of the peoples among whom he dwelt touched him deeply and he came to speak the languages of the peoples, and throughout all that remained an Oriental. He has preserved the motor-sensory limitlessness of his fundamental character with its accompanying qualities: the predominance of the sense of time and the rapid functioning of the conceptual faculty. He has preserved within himself the elemental drive toward oneness and the immanent demand therefor, and though these have been all but buried and often corrupted, they have never been crushed. You will discover them in the most assimilated of Jews if you know how to lay bare his soul. And though he may have exterminated the last vestige of Judaism from the *content* of his consciousness, yet inexpugnably his Jewishness will be found to have stamped the *form* of his thinking. But luminous from afar, these trends live on in those Jewish folk-masses of Eastern Europe who are so poor in the devices of civilization but, despite the gnawing of disintegration and decay, so rich in the power of their unborrowed ethos and the immediate functioning of the spirit. Regard the Chassid of our day, unworthy descendant of

his forbears that he is, and still a marvel. Behold him pray to his God, shaken by his fervor, expressing with his whole body what his lips articulate—a sight at once grotesque and sublime. Or watch him as with regal gestures and entire consecration he celebrates that ushering out of the Sabbath on which depend the mysteries of world-redemption. Regard these scenes and be convinced that here, distorted and enfeebled, you behold still recognizable the might and spiritual inwardness of the East.

Now my belief in a renewed spiritual and religious creativity of the Jewish people is based upon this manifest or latent Orientalism of the Jews, this groundwork of their being which has been preserved despite all obstacles. In the isolation and dividedness of his Occidental life the Jew can produce only fragmentary results. He can attempt daring works of the spirit and stamp himself upon daring words; upsurges of religious passion can issue like lightning from the cloudy womb of his folk. But a great creation that unites all the trends of his being and reestablishes the true continuity of Jewish development and lends an adequate expression to the eternal striving after oneness will not arise until there is reestablished the continuity of that Palestinian life from which the great conceptions of Judaism once issued forth.

The Jew is not the same today that he was then. He has gone through all the paradises and all the infernos of the Occident, and his soul is not unscathed. But his primal power is undiminished; perhaps it is purified of dross. And when that power is reunited to its maternal earth it will become creative once again. The Jew can truly fulfil his function amid the peoples only when once more with all that undiminished purified primal energy of his he proceeds to translate into reality the monitions of his antique period: reintegration with his native earth, the proving of his notion of the good life there, the erection of a model human community upon that strip of Canaanic earth.

The Central Myth

The fundamental idea of the Jewish religion and the kernel of that Jewish monotheism which has been so constantly misunderstood and so unendurably rationalized is the consideration of all things as expressions of the Divine and of all occurrences as manifestations of the absolute. To the other great monotheist of the East, to the Indic sage, as we see him in the Upanishads, sensuous reality is an illusion which must be transcended if man is to enter the world of truth; to the Jew the visible world is a revelation of God's mind and will. Hence to the Indic sage, as later to the Platonist, all myth is metaphor; to the Jew it is the veracious account of the manifestations of God on earth. The ancient Jew could not narrate otherwise than in the form of myth, because no event seemed worthy of being narrated to him until it had been grasped according to its divine and permanent meaning. All the narrative books of the Bible have but one subject: the meetings of Yahveh with His people. Later, when He had passed from the visibility of the pillar of fire and from the audibility of thunder over Sinai into the darkness and silence of bodilessness, it is noteworthy that the continuity of mythic narrative is not broken. True, Yahveh can no more be perceived by the senses. But all His manifestations in history and nature can still be perceived. And these manifestations are the boundless subject-matter of our post-Biblical myth.

From what I have said it will be clear what I consider to be the peculiar stamp born by the mythic world-view of the Jews. It does not abrogate causality; it substitutes a metaphysical for an empiric causality and assumes a causal nexus between the facts of experience and the being of God. This idea is not limited to the sense that the facts are effected by God. The contrary conception, profounder and more fruitful, is ever more strongly set in relief, that,

namely, of man's influence and of the influence of his deeds upon the nature of the Divine. This view, of which very early embodiments, at once naïve and mystical, exist and which found its highest expression in Chasidism, teaches that the Divine slumbers in all things and can be awakened only by him who accepts them consecratedly and sanctifies himself in them. Phenomenal reality is divine but it must be made real in its divine nature by him who truly experiences it. The emanation of the Divine is exiled into hiddenness; it lies fettered at the core of each thing and can be redeemed within each by the man who, contemplatively or through action, redeems and liberates that thing's soul. Thus each man is called to codetermine the fate of God through his own life, and every mortal is deeply rooted within the living myth.

VI

The Only Way

We have tested the various answers to the question, what is Israel to do? We have tested them and have rejected them, all but one. We have found the right way, the only way, the way that leads through Zion to a renovation of human society. In the Messianic dreams and passions of the exile there were always blended national and broadly human elements, a yearning for political emancipation and spiritual redemption, a striving after an actual reconquest of our land and after an ideal society. Thus fulfilment of his needs was held out to the Jew both as member of a folk and as a member of all humanity, and in such aspirations the Jewish tendency toward the realization of dream in action found its refuge.

When the modern Zionist movement made the will to recreate a Jewish Palestine the centre of a political movement, this will was conceived of as a predominantly nationalistic one. Zionism strove to be essentially a national

movement, analogous to many other movements in the Western World, differing from these only by the necessity of colonization. The leaders of the movement did, indeed, sincerely delineate the picture of a juster society; they favoured modern methods of settlement. But the deeper passion and stronger colours of the movement were unmistakably revealed whenever it was a question of pointing the way to a rebirth and to the founding of a national culture. This was undoubtedly the centre and core of the movement. History, however, does not reveal a single genuine renaissance movement that has been the issue of purely nationalistic tendencies. The aim was never an aim after specific forms. At the heart of every true renaissance dwelt the passionate aspiration after new contents for human life; its foundation was broadly humanistic and it succeeded in creating new forms only because the force of the new contents broke the traditional forms. The nationalistic speech-cultures of Europe arose because a new world of values was struggling toward free expression. Not Hebraism, therefore, but Hebraistic humanism—taking the word in its broadest historical signification—must be the kernel of a Jewish movement of regeneration.

That means it is necessary to grasp and renew with impassioned zeal the great human contents of Judaism. More precisely, it is necessary to grasp and reëmbody in life its greatest central tendency of the direct realization of metaphysical aims in human experience. If that is done the national form will, as it were, build itself. National culture is not merely the productivity of a given people nor the sum of the works produced by it. Such culture does not come into being until common work issues forth from a common spirit and a common life. It follows that if the Jewish tendency of realization lays hold of Zionism, a strengthening and not a weakening of the movement's national character will result; it follows that the national idea will become substantive through Zionism, which will thus begin to evolve from a national movement into a

national reality. For not until in some new form the national and the human desire for political liberation and spiritual redemption, desire for the land of the fathers and the good society, are inextricably blended, will the regeneration of the Jewish people take place.

A word of warning is here to be issued to those who exclude all but political considerations and methods. A Jewish society or state is to be built in Palestine. If it is to be a society or state that drags out a trivial and profane existence, like all the numerous small states of Europe, an existence in which spirit and folk are divorced, in which an abstract intellectuality and an unideal mass furnish side by side—a society that substitutes effectiveness for worth and reciprocal exploitation for reciprocal helpfulness and in which human beings hesitate to destroy each other because they need or fear each other—if this kind of a Jewish society is built in Palestine with its war of all against all, even though it declare itself a thousand times to be politically “neutral,” then it will be crushed by the machinery of intrigue. Only as a spiritual force can it endure. A spiritual force! No, this does not mean a high intellectual level and cultural productivity. It means the embodiment in concrete terms of that spirit which lives among all the peoples today as suffering, as bitterness, as rebelliousness, as yearning and as dream, but nowhere achieves embodiment of form because the rule of evil about and within the peoples is too strong. It means the blending, the mutual interpenetration of spirit and folk. It means the transcendence of the dualisms of truth and reality, idea and fact, morals and politics. It means the complete substitution of communal feeling for the conventionally tempered inner war of the social process. It means religion—a religion of the common life, the revelation of God in society, an experienced religion. It is this and this alone which at the crisis of the ages can as a spiritual force face the foul forces of the age, even as Moshe faced Pharaoh. But this will in truth be able to do so. For

the land in which the universal aspiration of mankind first comes true will be henceforth the sanctuary of the peoples and the folk that first pointed the way toward fulfilment will be the eternal and inviolable priest at that shrine.

VII

The Primal Powers

Research into our total Scriptures and merging with the life of our people will enable a generation at once reverent and free of mind to retread the way from the primal forces that fashioned and express us even unto this age in which it lives.

Our age, more clearly even for Israel than for the other peoples, is an age of fatefulness and liberation, of both errancy and return. It is decisive for all mankind today, whether the burgeoning religious feeling of a new generation achieves both maturity and leadership. For the special fate of the Jewish people it is decisive whether the generation of this crisis will be able to reëmbody within itself the primordial forces which shapes us. And that means, whether it will be able to find again in its own soul the forces that have animated our conflicts and our creative deeds, undiminished in vigour and in joy. Both of these decisive questions, the general human one and the specific Jewish one, have the same core and kernel. For the awakening religious yearning of mankind is profoundly allied to the primal fashioning forces of Judaism.

Only by setting out upon the path of those forces from their beginning on can the Jewish generation of this crisis come to a full realization of itself. Having done that, having found those forces within its own mind and character, it can set about making its inner choices and directing its inner energies toward their goal.

Now if in truth those primal forces are to come to life in a new Jewish generation and are to be effective through

it, that generation, profoundly animated by them, must create for them as a community the new workshop upon that immemorial earth where sparks of their old fire still glow amid the dust and ashes.

Our task is to build that community—the community of those who, united by a common work and common sacrifices, fare forth in the name of the nameless God to the Zion of His fulfilment. The secret in their hearts, transcending the trammels of lore and law, must aspire to that which as yet has neither name nor form. But the recognition of the forces that of old shaped Israel will reveal to them the power by virtue of which living flesh will clothe the seared bones. That power is the human answer to God's command which leads to the unification of spirit and nature. Out of the fatefulness of our age there is but one liberation—that which leads to freedom in God. If we have this knowledge, not as mere conceptualism nor as mere attitude, but as an unanswerable human dynamism, then we shall, separated as we may seem to the dulled vision to be from our tradition, have found the reconnexion with the eternal stride of Judaism.

ALFONSO PACIFICI

The populous Ashkenazic communities of northern Europe and America often during the post-emancipatory period lost touch with their Sephardic brethren scattered along the shores of the Mediterranean. Merging with the nations tended to separate Jews from Jews. The spiritual unity of Israel is still far from complete. Yet the Jews of Italy, of Greece, of Turkey, and of North Africa not only preserved many of the most antique traditions (including the classical pronunciation of Hebrew and the oldest melodies, *niggun*, *H.naggen*) and were often examples of an exquisite and living piety, but they have shared vigorously in the modern renaissance of the people. Fiery Revisionist Zionists are to be met in the *souks* of Tunis, and Saharan communities are passing under the leadership of a younger nationalist generation.

Italian Jewry, numbering between 40,000 and 50,000 souls, was never, even during the height of the assimilatory age, without saintly and energetic representatives. Such was the Rabbi Elia Benamozegh (1822-1900), whom the most distinguished of recent Christian converts to Judaism, M. Aimé Pallière, has so beautifully commemorated in *Le Sanctuaire Inconnu* (Paris, 1927). The change in the temper of the times is illustrated by the fact that Signor Dante Lattes (b. 1876), perhaps the best-known Italian Hebraist, has been since 1928 president of the Italian Zionist Organization and has translated Achad Ha'Am into Italian. It is characteristic of Sephardic Jewry that Signor Lattes has never questioned the necessary synthesis of Jewish religion and nationality and has written a profound and striking exposition of the former (*Apologie de*

L'Hébraïsme. French translation by M. Formont, Paris. n.d.).

Concerning Alfonso Pacifici, author of the following selections from the Fragments on the Unity of Israel, published in Florence in 1912, no biographical data are available. Signor Pacifici has chosen, more and more as the years have gone on, to live in complete retirement from public life. Yet the change that has come over Italian Jewry in the past twenty-five years is universally ascribed to his personal influence. That change has been enormous. It is obvious how easy superficial assimilation is in countries with South Latin-Moorish populations. One Mediterranean cannot be told from another. Nevertheless, the finest, most intelligent, and most spirited of Italian Jews have in recent years reallied themselves, both religiously and nationalistically, with their people and have embraced the doctrine of *Ebraismo integrale* or "total Jewishness" illustrated by Lattes and first formulated and announced by Pacifici. Thus among Italian Jews there has arisen the excellent distinction between the *ritornando*, he who is on the return road to Judaism and the *ritornato*, he who has reached the goal. The number of *ritornati* has been steadily increasing and not a few of the sons of wealthy and distinguished Italian families have accepted the voluntary poverty and hardships of *Chalutzith* (Palestinian pioneering) and dig the fields and build the roads of Eretz Yisrael.

ALFONSO PACIFICI

I

Uniqueness

IT BEHOOVES us first and above all to have the insight and the courage to recognize the truth of our central position: that Judaism is not a dualistic system and therefore not a religion in the common acceptance of that word. Hence it is wrong and contrary to the nature of Judaism to seek to find in its concrete content any answer to the religious demands of dualism. Judaism is a *quid unicum* among the products of the human spirit and must be interpreted from within itself, and not by any analogy. Nor can it be classed with or locked into any category of historic phenomena of whatever kind.

It follows naturally that so soon as Jews recognize the character of the true, explicit, unique finality of Judaism and how magnificently it accomplishes its aim, constituting thus one of the great, incomparable and monolithic products of human culture—it follows that they will learn how to recognize themselves and their nature in Judaism.

II

Power

Our very existence today is a strident violation of all the accepted laws of history. According to any common criterion we should have ceased existing centuries ago.

No other people has survived dispersion and its process which is: dispersal, submergence, new folk on other earth. Yet we, dispersed over all the earth, remain ourselves through the millennia. All other peoples have one cycle of life: development, apogee, decline, and death. . . . We have been not once but again and again on the very edge of the abyss of extinction. We have always revived. If one knew nothing of the history of Israel except the approximate date of its emergence as a people upon the scene of earth and, in addition, only that it was still in existence, one would surmise that this people had the most tranquil of histories and resisted time by fossilization. . . . Our historic life, on the contrary, has been one long conflict. Instead of inertia and peace our portion has been the storm of battle and periodical decay so complete as to resemble death. But recurrent resurrections have always occurred. Nay, our life *consists* of resurrections.

Hellenism seemed to have tamed us. Hellenic morals had gone far toward conquering our ancient national ways, so that a high priest serving King Antiochus sacrificed a swine to the pagan deities in the Temple of Jerusalem. It needed but one family, the Maccabean, to reconsecrate us to our destiny.

Rome enslaved us, slew us, scattered us, destroyed our last and most venerated stronghold, and held us to be annihilated and gone. Scarcely fifty years had passed when under Trajan a furious revolt broke out. Sixteen years later the pride of the very empire trembled at the desperate revolt led by Bar Kochba. We were defeated; we were, as Rome thought, exterminated by boundless massacres. A core remained.

And again, during the eighteen centuries of our complete dispersion, a period which seems to our ignorant majority a long and sombre night between a classic past and a wretched present—how many miraculous rebirths have we not had; how tameless have been our aspirations toward our freedom and our native earth. According to

an apparently providential plan the centre of the national life shifts; a chance sprig is transplanted far away and gives birth to a new era of history just when the ancient trunk gives its last signs of life. . . .

The steady awareness of death among a people is the surest warrant of life. Other peoples have never had that awareness, and for that reason they have perished. That salutary awareness has never failed us yet. In days of grief and despair there has always arisen a voice to sound the alarm and always arrested the march of fate. This is that prophetic function which has perpetuated itself throughout our long history and this is the secret of our vitality. We have always consciously embodied our historic embodiment and have thus been able to remain masters of our future. But there remains the supreme question: Why is it that we and we only have possessed that conscious personification of our own permanence? . . .

And why, finally, have we always been so monstrously hated—with a hatred that has no parallel either for permanence or for intensity, neither for its manifestations nor for the mad excuses given for it from age to age? We look back upon millennia of hatred, contempt, persecution. Cicero speaks of the Jews in the same terms as an anti-Semite of today; before him the Greeks, the neighbouring peoples of Palestine, the immemorial Egyptians contributed to that same hatred with the same fantastic justifications. And for what other people have comparable means of torment been invented, such as the sudden mass-expulsions or the Ghetto imprisonment and the badges of shame? What other people has impelled humanity to the insane absurdity of Christian anti-Semitism? For what other people has given to humanity a God, the most powerful of gods and indeed a whole pantheon of gods, including the Mother of God? What other people has seen dedicated to the sons of its womb church and chapel, cathedral and basilica—all those innumerable St. Peters and St. Pauls, St. Johns and St. Marys?—And yet, because one of

its sons has become the Deity of Western mankind, it has not been glorified and exalted, but despised, downtrodden, and persecuted and labelled a people of deicides!

Our history and our character speak one word and express one concept: unity. Israel is one by its duration, one by its resistance to dispersion; it remains *one* people in its exile, and experiences as such continuous resurrections from death; it is one in the development of its historic life and one in the hatred that has accumulated on its defenceless soul. . . .

III

Rebirth

I have faith in our rebirth as in a thing sure, fated, inevitable. Disillusion may sap my temporary strength but cannot extinguish my faith, for that is henceforth an objective fact, having a life of its own, like the truths of mathematics.

I see within the Jewish people gigantic and specifically Jewish forces which need only to become conscious of themselves. The day on which we awaken to that, no obstacle in the world will keep them from being directed toward their destined end which had hitherto been vainly sought amid the agitations and distractions of our lives. . . .

I have come to subsume the typical Jewish characteristics of which I am speaking by the single word *excess*—i.e., exceeding the conventional norm of the non-Jewish world.

The Jews are excessive in the possession and practice of all intellectual and moral values: prone to great good and to great evil. They are excessive too in their abnormal desirousness, agitation, ambition, dissatisfaction. This side of their character has been most harshly blamed (even by themselves) and least well understood. . . .

This tendency to excess assumes very fine shadings when

one passes from the outer to the inner nature of the intellectual life of the Jews of all ages and not least of our own. The Jewish mind frets at the limitations of time and space and dwells on conceptions that lead to the infinite. Synthesis is its passion; even in its analytical processes synthesis is implicit and will suddenly, like some lyric flyer, set boldly out for the spaces of a beyond.

In those sciences that are most closely allied to practise—*i.e.*, in the social and political sciences—the Jewish genius strains ardently toward the future, toward a better world to come, and is incessantly and, as it were, prophetically impassioned by its vision of other things in distant times.

And even as in this kind of excess there is an element of the prophetic, so it is rare to see a Jewish scientist remain a mere theorist. Swiftly he becomes propagandist; he fires others; enthusiasms and polemics surround him. . . .

I am not frightened by the fact that so many of our great men hardly recognize themselves as Jews any more and seek their spiritual fatherland everywhere except in the antique heritage of their people. (*Written in 1912!* Editor.) . . . For what matters is this, that among our alienated great too there are found the eternal Jewish characteristics of the essentially prophetic type: the faculty of projecting into the future a unity of theory and practice and the power to move the hearts of men. What matters is that among these unwilling representatives of Israel, too, one discovers that quality which I have called excess, that wavelike energy, that almost wasteful force. . . .

The Jews are by their very essence destined to differentiate themselves intrinsically from other men. Hence they could create by the true direction of their being out of themselves a higher and an exemplary race. . . .

Hence we have but one enemy—conventional and subservient mediocrity. So long as we escape that, though the consciousness of right aim may be wanting, force remains.

Let us revive that consciousness; let us give our force its true direction. Rebirth will not delay.

HANS KOHN

Dr. Hans Kohn has been for a number of years one of the most influential and active intellectual guides of the Jewish world-movement. He was born in Prague in 1891 and early came under the influence of Martin Buber, to whose life and work he has recently dedicated a brilliant and profound study (*Martin Buber: Sein Werk und seine Zeit*, Berlin, 1932). As early as 1913 he edited the important symposium *Vom Judentum* (*Concerning Jews and Judaism*). He fought in the Austrian army during the war, spent some time as prisoner in Russia, and emerged from these experiences an uncompromising pacifist (active in the world organization of war resisters) who has sought to ground sociologically and ethically the union of nationalism and peace upon a Jewish ideological basis. He was for some years in the service of the *Keren Hayessod*, the foundation fund of the Zionist Organization, first in London, later in Jerusalem where he was one of the founders of the *B'rith Shalom* ("Covenant of Peace") society, whose object it is to cultivate relations of unswerving brotherliness and peace with the Palestinian Arabs.

Dr. Kohn's chief works are *Nationalismus*, 1922; *Sinn und Schicksal der Revolution* (*Meaning and Fate of the Revolution*), 1923, in which he drenched the Bolsheviks in his prophetic idealism; *Die politische Idee des Judentums* (*The Dominant Political Idea of Jewish History*), 1924; *History of Nationalist Movements in the Near East* (English translation, 1929). At present Dr. Kohn occupies the chair of modern history at Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.

The following pages are excerpted and translated from *Die Politische Idee des Judentums*, Dr. Kohn's central

and most significant work, the whole of which (together with Buber's chief works and many others excerpted in this volume) will be translated into English when the English-speaking Jewries (especially that of America) begin to awaken from their intellectual torpor.

HANS KOHN

The People of the Yoke

THE character of a people, as of an individual, cannot be grasped in its totality. It is recognized by us exclusively in that unfoldment and development in time which we call history. In this world of human history there arises and expands a unique psychical universe of which the willing, purposively acting individual is a member. In this universe, the character of which is made up of vital processes, such as striving and self-transcendence, there are no laws determined by any parallelisms in space; from the successive temporal stages of the process there arise corresponding directions of effort and corresponding tendencies. Tendency and trend take the place of the unity of law. We do not deal with successions of phenomena of one kind, but with series of unique phenomena which nevertheless tend in the same direction. Like all that pertains to life these tendencies of direction are never rigid, finished, or final; they are tensions and strivings and processes of becoming; their objective intellectual precipitations in the ideational world and culture of a people always appear in the nature of a task, never in that of a fulfilment.

Now in each people there exist, whether clear or blurred, the same universally human qualities. Every people has its share in the entire psychic world and wealth of humanity. But in different peoples different qualities, capacities and inclinations stand out in peculiar relief. A people, therefore, is not definable by the possession of definite characteristics, but by its tendency to emphasize certain char-

acteristics. Again, as is true of all that pertains to life, the boundaries of these tendencies are fluid, nor can they be fixed by definition or convention. Transitions are possible in every direction. The essential tendencies of a people always occur interwoven with others and seek to affirm themselves in conflict with those. Everything is tentative; there are constant possibilities of losing the path or of seeking a new one; nor is the road ever completed. It is lost in the distance toward which it strives, not wholly to be grasped or defined. What, nevertheless, are the tendencies that determine the character of the Jewish people?

Two types of humanity stand in clean contrast facing each other—the peoples of *time* and of *space*, the auditives (to Anglicize the terms of Rémy de Gourmont), and the visuals. The Greeks were the people of the eye, of the sense for space, of the plastic arts. An eminent scholar once called them “the eye of the world.” Their great gift was the gift of seeing; from it they derived their world significance; knowledge and seeing (not only in the etymology of *οἶδα*) were but a single thing to them. Their philosophy no less than their art is plastic, commanding space, transforming into space. It is as though they sought to transform all that is fluid, time-conditioned, interwoven, and tagential into the sharp limitations of immobility in space and to capture the formless in the rigidity of visual form. At its highest point their philosophy becomes plastic and their symbolic instrument is the chisel. The verb *ὀρίσκειν* means both “to limit” and “to form concepts.” To the Greek thoughts became plastic images. Plato’s ideas are primal images of the world, cleansed of the dross of becoming, reduced to the pure types of being. To the Greek the stone with which he builds is the symbol of space and seeing; to the Jew the stream in which he dips is the symbol of time and of becoming. “The tumultuous sea of the ages into which flows the river of becoming did not greatly impress the Greek. To his notion Athena always conquers Poseidon as the cliff does the sea; in his

landscape the streams are lost amid the stones." The Greek turns the world into marble and takes it out of time.

The Jew lives within time. He does not see as clearly as he hears. His senses are less aware of the contours than of the inner flowing of the world. His excelling organ is the ear and his form the call. His life and the life of his race stand under that unique heavenly configuration from which he hears for evermore, and only he, the *voice* of God and under which his historians have placed from the beginning the entire meaning of his record: the succession of being called and of turning a deaf ear to the call. Being forever called causes the Jew to hold himself tense toward the self-consuming action; he wills and the deed is his expression. He is the untiring propagandist, the unwavering messenger. His experience of the divine never permits him, like the Greek, to attain the peace of contemplation, of *θεωρία*, of a consuming self-sufficiency. He hears the call and must in obedience undergo the suffering of the lonely preacher in the desert, of the leader and awakener. But the apostasy of deafness to the call (which none is spared in his hour of doubt and despair and of the terrible inner absence from God—not Moses or Jeremiah or Jesus) protects him from deeming himself a direct partaker of the divine which, nevertheless, is the historic goal of all his yearning, and plunges him back into the irrational tragedy of humanity. The message of the prophets is *massa*, a burden, to them, and Moses complains: "I am not able to bear you myself alone. . . . How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden and your strife?" And not otherwise did Jeremiah speak in the deeply moving passage in which he curses his calling and the heavy burden of his being called: "O Yaveh, thou hast persuaded me, and I was persuaded; thou are stronger than I and hast prevailed: I am become a laughingstock all the day, everyone mocketh me. . . . Cursed be the day wherein I was born: let not the day wherein my mother bare me be blessed."

Thus to this folk did God become a voice. Again and again sounds the command, "Hear!" When Elijah becomes aware of God he hears only a still small voice. Therefore the Jew never made himself an image of his God. It is the word, the *λογος*, which to the Jew is the mediator between the infinite and the individual, and the word carries more of infinity within itself than the sharp form of the frozen image. The word of God is a creative word and the Jewish worker of wonders is "Master of the good Name."

Sight is the sense by which space is perceived as time is perceived by hearing. To the Greek only that which is limited in space is beautiful and perfect. Hence to him the most perfect of images is the circle. And what was true to the Greek in the sphere of æsthetics was equally true in the field of morals. It was the Jew Philo who first within the sphere of Hellenic thinking esteemed the infinite above the harmoniously finite. . . .

The Greeks were not only masters of the plastic arts, but created the drama from the inchoate spilth of song. But it has been remarked that they did not produce with equal greatness the poem conceived in solitariness. The psalm was, by contrast, the most characteristic form of poetry in Hebrew literature and to this day the Jew has remained a lyrist, master of the most fluid and subjective of forms which is farthest from the form of the chiselled stone.

The Jew, then, lives more awarely in time than in space. Henri Bergson made the living flowing continuity of time the substance of his philosophic vision and speaks of "time, concerning which we feel that it is the very stuff of which our life is made." And in Gustav Landauer's *Scepticism and Mysticism*, written in entire ignorance of Bergson's *Creative Evolution*, there is a chapter entitled "The World as Time," in which we read: "To express all spatial concepts in terms of time is perhaps one of the most important tasks of the humanity of the future. It were well once with the help of hearing to apperceive the world temporally and

to say. . . . Time should be substituted for space." The world as time cannot disintegrate into multi-dimensionality; it is one-dimensional; there is the line into the past; there is the forward urge into the future; the tension of directions is abrogated in the oneness of fluidity. The world as time is a world of polarity; the tradition of the past weighs it down; the impulse toward the future strains it toward the uncertain distance. It is alien from the balance of the forces that develop in spatial parallelism and rest harmoniously there; it is in itself in the nature of a force (rather than of mere being), one and not many-sided, inclined to extremes and averse from compromise, passionate after the infinite and so the foe of forms.

The human being who lives in this world, a world of becoming, will yearn as no one else does for a transcendence of this tension, for that unity in which all antinomies are resolved and this unity will, in fact, become both the aim and the task of his life. Martin Buber has called the Jew a phenomenon of polarity because in his character contradictions coexist in a state of extreme tension. Out of this polarity arises the striving after oneness. "Make my heart one!" cries the Psalmist. And Franz Werfel, a Jewish lyricist of our own day, prays in one of his poems:

Why gavest Thou me not oneness?
Cleanse and unite me, Eternal Fountain!
Behold Thy wiser children lament from of old
Continually concerning the number Two.

To the Jew God is the one, the only, He who has wrought oneness and so is the aim of the oneness in man. "Our God, make One Thy Name and build Thy kingdom," the liturgy has it in the daily evening prayer. The man at one and the One God belong together. In the Jew's chief prayer which he prays daily and which, first recorded in the fifth book of Moses, was pronounced by Jesus to be the central word, the unity of God is declared in a solemn invocation to the people. This invocation is followed here

too by a demand made of mortals. Man is to be undivided, homogeneous, whole and entire; he is not to swerve but bind his contrary proclivities and inclinations up into oneness. "With *all* thy heart and with *all* thy soul and with *all* thy might," are the well-known words. God is the reconciliation of the many in the One; it is man's duty to forge a oneness of the manifoldedness of his soul. Here, too, a dynamic and volitional attitude prevails. An eminent philologist has interpreted the ultimate meaning of the root El-God as "striving toward an aim or goal." God is man's aim; life is the way to Him through the dynamism of action. God *is*—but He *becomes* real in the life of man by man's active bearing of witness. Fundamentally the Jew values action; to him faith is secondary. In post-Pauline Christianity faith is decisive and conditions salvation. It was the profession of the right faith that bound Christians to each other. Judaism (including the Jew Jesus) however, emphasized the deed and the fulfilment of God's will through action. Judaism contained no binding dogmas of faith but the interpretation of God's will in respect of human action. The unity or integration of man is accomplished through action and concrete living, in the temporal continuance of spiritual struggle and in the tension of willing, not in cognitive vision. (The Greeks, on the other hand, did not doubt but what men would love virtue could they but awarely *see* it.) Nor has a Christian theologian failed to note how in Jesus the "centrifugal forces of his being were welded into a true oneness by the higher power of His overwhelming will." But the way of action leads through an uninterrupted series of decisions. The duty of decision constitutes both the burden and the nobility of our mortal fate. Choosing means tension, courage, danger. It is slackness, feebleness, sloth of the heart and cowardice that shrink from moral choice. This is the Jewish conception of sin. In fulfilment of the words of Genesis: "Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil," the Deuteronomist reiterates: "Behold I set before you

this day a blessing and a curse. . . . I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life." . . . And on the top of Carmel Elijah demanded of the people: "How long will ye limp to both sides? if Yaveh is God, follow Him; if Baal is God, follow *him*." "Ah, that thou wert either hot or cold," we hear in the Revelation of St. John. The One God requires man to be one, undivided, wholly dedicated to his task. This drive toward unity impels the Jew to make of unity the ideal of the world of man—and so to be the first among the peoples to conceive the notion of the oneness of humanity.

This Jewish thinking in terms of time produces its farthest-reaching result in the Jewish conception of history. It may well be, as Alexander von Humboldt maintained in his *Kosmos*, that the Jewish monotheistic view, which always regards the universe as indeed one and as directed by an undivided energy is important among the elements of human culture which, since the Renaissance, have inaugurated the modern observation of nature. To Jewish thinkers, however, nature was not the decisive element, but rather man and the actions of man, that is, history. Man introduced unity into the flow of time and significance into the running and drying up and springing forth again of events and his consciousness accepts these processes as one and homogeneous. The Jewish God is not a God in nature. In His solemn self-revelation he is not like Zeus *νεφεληγερετα*. He is the Lord of an historic event. "I am Yaveh, thy God, who brought thee out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." The social ethic which God demands is no mere commandment nor is it grounded in reason; it is historical in character. "Ye shall not oppress the strangers, for ye know concerning the heart of the stranger, for ye too were strangers in Egypt." And it is this consciousness of history that binds the generations. "Guard thyself and take heed, lest thou forgettest these stories that thou hast seen with thine own eye and that all thy life long they leave not thy heart, but that thou speak of them to thy children and

thy children's children." "When in days to come thy son asks thee: what are the witnessings and the commandments and the judgments that Yaveh our God has commanded, then thou shalt make answer to thy son: bondservants were we unto Pharaoh in Egypt, but Yaveh led us forth from Egypt with a strong hand." And to this day the Jews celebrate Pesach as though it were *they* themselves who had been saved from Egypt, as though the oneness of the generations merged above and within them, as though the historic past were not dead but a very living force within every hour of the present.

It is an historic consciousness of incomparable strength that animates this people, interpenetrates all its works and actions and gives it both a permanence and an inner certainty that are inexplicable otherwise. This people has established its home not in space but in time and in eternity and therefore time has no power over it. But on this account too every human action gains a new unheard-of value and a peculiar relationship to God. For history is the *path* of Yaveh. "I consider the deeds of Yaveh," the Psalmist sings, "I think of all Thy action and meditate concerning Thy great deeds." But God accomplishes his deeds through men. He has called and chosen them to be the bearers of the historic process. A gigantic responsibility rests upon them. By virtue of this fact men emerge from the context of nature and enter into that realm of history which, though spiritual and transcending nature, carries on its processes within nature. This is true of all men. For God's way is accomplished through all the peoples; all are his tools and building-stones and helpers. Once more from this point of view and only from this Jewish point of view we have the first vision of mankind as one—as humanity perceived and felt as such. Among the peoples Israel is elected in the sense that it is most powerfully aware of the meaning of history, of the burden of the calling of God, of the presage of that end of things which its leaders have in all ages passionately yearned after as the

goal of all mankind. For the way of God demands the ethical activity of man and human striving after perfection. It is terrifying to be torn out of nature into the storm of God. And nature and the natural instincts of man rebel again and again and apostasy takes place and courage faints. Since the exodus out of Egypt there goes through the Jewish people an eternal plaint after the flesh-pots of the life of nature and apostasy from God's way continually recurs.

The teachers of later ages sought—successfully but not without creating new dangers—to sanctify through ever more intricate regulations all the activities of life and thus constantly to relate them to God's will. They sought by this means to create security in place of the ever renewed necessity of moral decision and its danger. This method made the burden heavier and yet eased the bearing of it and simplified while it complicated. But the aim remained the same. The historic consciousness of the Jewish people establishes oneness within the happenings in time; since Amos the concept of world-history as a unified process is set into ever higher relief; the duty of man to be the ethically active embodiment of this process became a certainty upon the acceptance of the Law and the covenant under Moses and needed to receive from the words of the Prophets only its framing of universal history. The crown of this homogeneous historical process is its ultimate goal—God. His way (namely, human history) is the way to Him. . . .

Out of the primary elements of the Jewish character—its self-realization within time, its historical consciousness, its demand upon itself of ethical action—arose the Messianic yearning. To the Jew the world of the future is not a beyond, but the becoming and the coming time—*olam haba*. It is the time of oneness, of the becoming at one with himself of every human creature in that he is undividedly and with his whole self given over to God; it is the time of the union of all men in brotherly at-oneness

and of the oneness of all nature in peace. This Jewish vision is the first vision of all mankind grown perfect; by virtue of it the passion of man embraced the struggle for the absolute and infinite, and a forever inextinguishable disquietude came into the world which through the instrument of Christianity communicated itself to the pagan peoples. The goal is set: the kingdom of God, the Messianic realm of the future. The way is found: to do the will of God, that is to say, to practice justice, to become perfect, even as He is perfect, to sanctify oneself because He is holy and in order that He may be sanctified. All men strive after the kingdom. But the Jews as a people, from the time of their becoming a people onward, have been the heralds and forerunners of this striving. Despite apostasies they have through all their myriad martyrs and through all their leaders, through Moses and the Prophets, through Jesus and the Talmudic sages and the Baal Shem tov and through the many millions who, unknown and forgotten, have lived for the sanctification of the Name and the coming of the kingdom—through all these they have been the people of the yoke, the folk of spiritual responsibility.

HUGO BERGMANN

The senior member of that Prague group to which belong Hans Kohn, Max Brod, and, despite a different type of talent and hence development, Franz Werfel, Dr. Bergmann was born in that city in 1893. He allied himself with the Zionist movement in his student days, but his technical field was that of philosophy. On a neo-Kantian basis (though quite independently of Hermann Cohen) he addressed himself from the start to the major problems of epistemology and ethics, steadily aware from the first, as Cohen had not been, of the pertinence of Jewish tradition and philosophy and of the Jewish character of his own mind. His central contribution to philosophy is the reinstatement of moral freedom. He arrived at his conclusions independently of the psychologists (as pointed out and admitted by Otto Rank) and independently too of the new physics, on the metaphysical aspects of which he has however written (*Der Kampf um das Kausalgesetz in der jüngsten Physik. The Controversy concerning Causality in Recent Physics*), 1929. His position is briefly as follows: There is an *ens* that is never object. That thing or being is the human "I." The "I" can be experienced only by itself and can never be objectivized, because its existence depends on its self-cognition. Nor does there objectively exist a "thou"; for only consciousness of an "I" creates a "thou." Hence, were we able (as we are not) to tabulate all the processes of the universe according to iron laws of causality, yet the "I" would be exempt from those laws, since it is not and can never be part of that universe which is its object but which does not contain it. "Freedom is therefore possible, though Kant's proof of causality may be admitted." But this moral freedom

which exists yields on a higher plane to necessity, since it is man's duty to incorporate into his will by means of his freedom the high inevitabilities of his true destiny. (Cf. Rank: "Volitional affirmation of the obligatory.") Hence Dr. Bergmann points out, for instance, the high wisdom of the Talmudic saying, "Greater is he who is commanded and acts than he who is not commanded and acts." The consent of the will to high duty is nobler than an arbitrary exercise of freedom even for good. When we have established freedom the crucial question is, Freedom unto what?

Dr. Bergmann, among many other works, has written the first Hebrew monograph on Kant and contributes constantly, on philosophical and Jewish subjects, to German and Hebrew periodicals. Having worked as librarian in the university library of Prague (1916-19) he was called in 1920 to the directorship of the Hebrew University library in Jerusalem. He also teaches modern philosophy at the university and edits the Hebrew bibliographical publication *Kiryat Sefer*.

The following extracts are taken from a small book called *Javne und Jerusalem*, published in 1919, long out of print (the copy here used was generously furnished by Dr. Bergmann himself) and in danger of being neglected. Yet it is one of the profoundest and most exquisite documents of the entire Jewish renaissance in which, as an intellectual force in the immediate present, Dr. Bergmann deserves to rank second to Buber alone.

HUGO BERGMANN

I

True Autonomy

WE RESIST the penetration of capitalism and mercantilism into Palestine. How can we at this moment in history reconcile that with our conscience? Dare we burden this Zionist undertaking in addition to its thousand difficulties with the additional load of embodying a new economic order? And even if we dared—is the thing possible? Can we found a non-capitalistic island in the circumambient capitalistic sea? Will not the waves overwhelm us? Capitalism is still the law of the greater part of the economic system. How then shall we escape obedience to that law? It will be urged, then, that all anti-capitalistic talking and planning on our part is romanticism and utopianism. Worse still, it will be judged to be treachery against our leaders and those who are realizing our dream of Zion and a stab in their back.

I can hear the endless critical variations upon this theme. The so-called wholesome common sense of the majority will be aroused against us. We shall not yield to it. For we do not acknowledge any economic order to be necessary. Our law is that of our will. At this time when we see by the example of Zionism what miracles can be wrought by the will of a people, shall we let *them* lead us who do not yet see that every Utopia of yesterday *may* be the reality of tomorrow? Such is our historic fate that it can be tested only by a great act of willing. Gradually

the societies to combat anti-Semitism became objects of ridicule. The idea of the Jewish state, on the contrary, became a practical political matter. Similarly now and here: The notion of realizing the Zionist hope through a merely capitalistic colonization is sure to fail. The problem will be solved by an economic attitude that is new and unheard-of in the Western World.

The practical people will protest in vain. Zionism is not a merely practical matter and is not to be justified on merely economic grounds. From a capitalistic point of view the Arab furnishes cheaper labor than the Jew and capitalistic industrialization will attract quite other elements than ourselves. Even before the war Christian Arabs began to come pouring in from Syria. If this kind of capitalism opens the land it will at the same time be closed to us.

And what attraction could a Westernized Palestine exert upon the Jews? . . . Only if Palestine offers great tasks will it attract the best among us. Mere capitalistic industry and trade will draw hungry people; the bearers of our ideal will remain estranged and cold. But let us imagine a Palestine in which a serious attempt is made to place human society upon a new foundation; let us imagine that Judaism, the ideas of which have hitherto always been confined to the cloudy realm of theoretical discussion, is now actually to be realized and that we are to make a truly Jewish land of Palestine! That is at least to dream greatly. Only so could the land once more become a holy land and the focus of our life.

Let it be admitted at once that we do not dream of returning to a pre-capitalistic economy. We are not so foolish as to resist the machine. Wherever capitalistic methods enable us to save on man-power, we shall use them. We are far removed from any reactionary romanticism. We are practical men in a world of reality; only our reality is not that of today but that of tomorrow.

Precisely this sober facing of reality involves one de-

mand: Palestine must become economically independent. We do not want to turn Palestine into an "economic bridge"; we must, above all things, be spared the quarrels of the capitalistic world and its conflicts over strategic security, foreign markets and trade routes. We desire to live unto ourselves and in peace, and by so doing we hope to make a modest contribution toward the liberation of all mankind from the curse of these conflicts. We must give the outer world as little opportunity as possible to mingle in our affairs and to assimilate our spirit to that of the West of this age. . . .

Hence our aims: economic independence and the founding of our entire economic structure upon an agricultural basis. By the most intensive cultivation a maximum must be wrung for our soil. This intensive culture is the central problem of our national existence. At the very beginning of our colonization Achad Ha'Am criticized the cultivation of the vine where grain could be planted, since the exportation of wine would make us dependent upon foreign economic problems. The goal of our peasantry must be the product of the soil itself and not the money that can be obtained for it in foreign markets.

Hence what we resist is not capitalistic technique; it is the capitalistic spirit. Factories and machines do not constitute capitalism. It is the spirit that animates both industrialist and operative and in which the inhabitant of the country expects to enjoy the products of his work. For the operative thinks and feels capitalistically no less than the owner, when he has no inner relationship to his work, when it is indifferent to him whether he produces agricultural machinery on the one hand or wasteful trash or even armaments on the other; when, above all, he cultivates a class egoism, which would sacrifice the agriculture of his own country merely that he may buy cheaper bread baked of foreign wheat. In brief, capitalism not only alienates man from his work, but estranges man from his brother and substitutes for an unselfishly inspired folk-

group the stark egoism of economic classes. . . . The conquest of capitalism will be achieved through the development of a new human type—a type that is firstly modest in its material demands, secondly, is consciously an organic part of its folk-group and which, finally, regards its own labor as a part of the creativity of its folk-group with the understanding that this group must give him time and leisure to enjoy the fruits of its total creativity. It is only an educational process which can produce this new human type.

Now this educational process is none other than that which Zionism desires to apply to the entire Jewish people. Palestinian colonization is not the innermost aim of Zionism. I am almost tempted to call it a pretext. The aim is the creation of a new type of Jew. In place of the Jew who is a victim of the merely material and who worships lifeless things a Jew is to appear whose life is rooted in the spirit, who is animated by love and sacrifice.

Our congresses and offices and committees must clarify their consciousness of the fact that there exists a specifically Zionist economic attitude. We are not to forget that in Hebrew there is only one word—*Avodah*—for work and worship. Our workers will, I hope, preserve the feeling for the difference between significant and meaningless work. . . . I nurse the hope that our workers will be concerned over other and deeper relationships in life. Those marvelous human beings who, even before the war, were agricultural labourers in Palestine have shown that Jewish workers can be prepared to risk their entire being for the creation of a new kind of human society. Our workers should be inspired by an ideology that will render them independent of capitalism. They will refuse to enter that mad witches' dance of capitalism whereby useless things are produced for which thereupon, through fashion and advertising, an artificial and wasteful demand is created, so that in the end great masses of people employ each other without any resultant enjoyment or true profit. . . . It is

my hope that our workers will liberate themselves from the bonds of that insane fatalism which makes of men the mere objects of an economic order and will come to see that any economic order is the result of an active human will.

If such an economic ideology prevails it will save us from the class struggle which might so easily tear our young commonwealth asunder. . . . The mutual distrust which makes each man regard the other as his natural enemy is a fundamental characteristic of capitalism. It is only with the elimination of the capitalistic attitude that this distrust can be cleansed out of the soul and that our people can be united by the solidarity of their love for land and folk. There will remain conflicts among the classes, but not that hostility which grows out of regarding economic classes as fixed and fatal. Our millennial sufferings have forged us into one; a spirit of solidarity has become almost innate; it will be our task to transform this feeling from a mere passive "sticking-together" into a vital, ethical impulse toward mutual trust and coöperation. Life upon the soil of the homeland will make our people trustful and faithful. Let us be on our guard, therefore, against permitting the idea of the agricultural colonization of Palestine to be darkened by the hope of rapid conquest through industry and trade. Exaggerated urbanism would tend to emphasize all the unpleasant Jewish traits once more. . . .

Now when we say that we must be on our guard against excessive urban development and must not through the mere ambition for numbers risk a wound to the spirit of our community, we receive this customary answer: "Very well. But it is a political necessity that we shall constitute as soon as possible a majority of the population." There are those of us who regard this policy as wholly evil. We do not desire to enter the land as rulers. Our claim is not derived from numbers, but from the eternal yearning of our people for Palestine. Before the Areopagus of the nations the great Zionist cry of Yehuda Halevi constitutes

a stronger right and claim than a few thousand more or less in Palestine on any given date. It is most true that we desire to animate the land with our very souls and to become its decisive spiritual power and representative. But that is not a quantitative question. If by an over-rapid colonization we drag the misery of European masses into Palestine; if, by exploiting the touristic possibilities of the country, we enter it as chafferers and advertisers and perhaps as chiefs and desecrate our holy places into show places for tourists, we may within a brief period constitute a majority of the population, but Palestine will be none the less a wholly un-Jewish land and the smallest Chasidic *Klaus* in the remotest Polish village will be the depository of more true Judaism than all the so-called national institutions. . . . To all those finally who, dazzled by the momentary political constellation, are in mere haste and would deny the Zionist spirit of our resettlement even for a moment we must say in all seriousness: for two thousand years the Jewish people has sustained its very life by the hope of some day leading a better, worthier, and purer life in Palestine. So long as we had not Palestine we were in the position of the sinner who can still hope and who can endure his degraded life because he can still say, "Tomorrow I shall lead a new life or day after tomorrow." Thus did we live in hope and thus were we able to bear the evil and the oppression and the corruption of exile. But the realization of our hope is also its end and Zionism will be either the triumph or the downfall of the Jewish people.

II

The Sanctification of the Name

(Kiddush Hashem)

In the twenty-second chapter of Leviticus there is a passage designed to be the starting-point of one of the most

peculiar religious conceptions of the Jewish people. It is written there: "Therefore shall ye keep my commandments and do them: I am Yaveh. And ye shall not profane my holy name; but I will be sanctified in the midst of the children of Israel: I am Yaveh who sanctifieth you."

The extraordinary element in this verse is contained in the word *V'nikdashiti*—"I will be sanctified." God, the Holy One, He who himself, as it is written, confers holiness, is to be sanctified through the children of Israel. One would be inclined to regard this verse as merely metaphorical. But it is proposed to show here that the meaning is an extraordinarily profound one and that this verse has correctly been called the epitome of Israel's faith.

Let us first be quite clear as to the meaning of the word *Kadosh*—holy. The use of this word in the Bible points to an intimate connexion between the demand of holiness and the demand of ethical living. Holiness, in this sense, is the peculiar mode of ethos which is characteristic of God. It is He who sanctifies. First of all, then, man is confronted by the ethical command as by an alien and objective force. Our oral tradition relates that when the revelation was made to Israel at Sinai, God "covered the people with the mountain as with an empty barrel." The ethical command is *first* something imposed from without. Although we can obey the moral law only in freedom and there can be no compulsion toward ethical action, since compulsion would render action either unethical or ethically neutral, nevertheless, man, as mere man, can follow the ethical command only after a conflict with nature. God, on the other hand, is conceived of as the originator of the moral law—not in the sophistical sense as though, like a moody despot, he stamped actions as ethical or unethical as He desired, but in the sense that truth and righteousness are coincident with his being and inseparable therefrom. He is the Holy One, for righteousness streams from him in perfect purity, without resistance or conflict.

But this explanation seems at first to render the concept

of sanctification all the more difficult. If God is holy, why is it written that He is to be sanctified through man? To understand that we must enter more deeply into the notion of God which characterizes the Jewish religion. This notion is fundamentally different from any that is familiar in the conceptual world of Western culture. In that world God and the universe exist as given once and for all and earth and man are separated from God. Judaism also separates God and the world, but it so integrates the fate of both that not only is the world dependent on God, but (this being our central point) the fate of God is dependent on that of the world. The contrast between the strictly Western and the Jewish notion can perhaps best be characterized by saying that according to the former the relation of God to the world is static and according to the latter it is dynamic. According to the former God *is* and is one and is holy. The Jewish view regards God from the standpoint of man as man's aim and task. Whether the interpretation of *El* and *Elohim* as *aim* is philologically sound or not, it coincides very happily with the Jewish conception. To man God is the task that is to be fulfilled, the aim that is to be achieved. Even that quality of God which is the most significant one to the Jew, namely his unity, is dynamically conceived. We do not speak of the unity but of the unification—the becoming one—of God: *Yishud Ha'shem*, the unity of God—thus the Zohar teaches—depends upon the prayers of men. . . . At the close of the day of atonement the ritual demands the sevenfold repetition of the formula, "*Yaveh is Elohim!*" This is the expression of the Jews' highest mystery. The inner elevation in which he has passed the day of atonement has caused Yaveh and Elohim to reunite: the creation, of which Elohim is the principle, has merged again with its primordial source, Yaveh, the divine sustainer. Through the intensity of his prayer the Jew has reconciled the Many with and into the One and can now exclaim: The Many is One and the world is divine and Yaveh is Elohim. The sevenfold repeti-

tion of this cry at the close of the day of atonement expresses all that has been achieved by the prayer and the fasting and the contemplation of the day.

From a human point of view, then, God is essentially a task and his fate depends in so far forth on man. In the Midrash *Va'Yikra Rabba* it is written: "And if ye do thus," says God, "if ye are united in a covenant, in that selfsame hour I arise, I am magnified." And in another Midrashic passage a very profound reason is given why God has made Israel his dwelling-place: "Have you ever heard of a bargain in which not only the object in question but he who sells it, too, is acquired? Certainly not! But I, God says, have not only given over to you my Torah, but I am given over to you with it." And that does not mean only that he who is at the centre of the Torah can judge and decide in God's place—"the just man determines and the Holy One, blessed be he, executes" (Gemarah Shabbath 59); it means that God's fate is in the hands of the righteous. Further citations are: in Psalm 68 we read "Give the power unto God!" which the *Midrash Yalkut* interprets thus: "The righteous add their power to the power above." And in the *Midrash Bereshith Rabbah* it is written: "The evil exist by the mercy of God; but the righteous—God exists by virtue of them, for it has been said: Behold, the Lord is founded on him. . . ."

The Kabbalah explains the influence of the righteous man upon the world above thus: he cannot influence that world in its own nature, but he can influence it in its relation to our human world. Through the just actions of the righteous the steady flow of grace from the infinite, the *Ensof*, into the *Sephiroth*, the emanations, is so increased that they overflow and all the worlds are beneficently flooded. . . .

Thus man, no less than God, sustains the universe. God created the world, but man sustains it in that he recognizes its divine nature. He sustains his human world by uniting it with the divine, by drawing the divine down

into the human. He who performs a righteous deed, a just judge for instance, becomes the comrade of the Holy One in an eternal creativeness.

Now even as man renews the work of creation through righteous action, so too his sin is active in a degradation of the divine. A wound (*Pegimah*) is inflicted not only upon the soul of the sinner, but also upon the glory of God, so that it sinks to a "lower level." In the Zohar it is related of God that he called out to Adam: "Woe unto thee that thou hast weakened the might above and darkened the higher light." Equally beautiful and profound is another passage in which the banishment of man from Eden is interpreted in the sense that through the sin of man God Himself was driven forth from paradise. . . .

Quotations from Jewish literature in which the dependence of the divine upon human action is emphasized could be indefinitely multiplied. . . . It is not a little difficult to think this concept through and at the same time to bring it in harmony with the other certainties by which all Jewish thinking is penetrated, the certainty of the existence of God. If God *is*, how can He be dependent on us and how can His being be interrelated with our doing? Why does the creature react upon the creator and how can men sanctify God?

For there must be no mistake about this: to dissolve the idea of God entirely into that of aim, to think God purely in terms of *telos* (purpose)—that would be to miss entirely the Jewish concept of God. It is raised above all doubt in Jewish thinking that God exists, independent of a human realization of him. But here comes the decisive turning-point of Jewish thought: God exists only unto Himself; he is no objective being which one can grasp or have from without as one grasps a thing. Hence he exists only *for* the man united to Him. Thus the Jew asks: how then does God exist for me? And he answers: in that in my life He becomes my deed; by bearing witness to Him

I have made Him a reality in my world. Thus in the *Pisikta* of R. Kahana to the verse, "Ye are my witnesses, says the Eternal and I am God," it is written: R. Shimeon Ben Yochai interpreted: "If ye bear witness to me then I am the Eternal. If ye are not my witnesses, I am not."

The unfathomably profound phrase with which God revealed Himself to Moses in the burning bush—the *Ehye Asher Ehye*—may undoubtedly be soundly interpreted as "I am that I am." But this "am" is an imperfect tense; it marks a tense or time that is not completed and may therefore be quite correctly rendered by "I will be." God revealed Himself, in brief, as the existing but at the same time imperfect and yet to be perfected "I." . . .

Thus the divine has this peculiar double nature: it is and it is for us to recreate. It "is" for God himself and for him who is at one with God; to be recreated by him who is outside of this unity. Thus a duality was assigned to the concept of God which was expressed sometimes by differentiating between the name (*Shem*) and the being, and sometimes by the division of the exiled glory (*Shechinah*) from God. . . .

Thus we can understand that only once a year, on the day of atonement at the moment of highest religious emotion, did the high priest pronounce the name of God. The congregation, however, who heard the name of the unity (*Shem Hamyuchad*), but was not supposed, like the high priest, to have attained the highest at-oneness, answered: "Praised be the name of the glory of his kingdom in eternity." . . .

From all this it follows that the human soul is of an infinite preciousness to the Jew, since it is the place at which the central miracle of unification is wrought—the soil from which God can and does bloom forth. Therefore in the *Aboth* of R. Nathan, R. Nehemia could say: "A single human being is of equal value with the whole creation." And in the tractate *Sanhedrin* of the Talmud it is written: "It is the duty of each man to regard himself as

though the entire universe had been created for his sake." . . .

Such a valuation of man would today be called anthropocentrism. But the Jew knows just as well as the European that man is only a handful of dust. But he sees in addition that that which characterizes man as man, namely his moral freedom, lifts him at once out of the universe of mere objects. Because man can freely decide, because he can liberate himself from the web of the conditioned and rise into the world of the unconditioned—therefore is he the chariot of God. This freedom of man would not be possible if in his life there did not exist a Yes and a No, a good and an evil. It is by virtue of his power to say No to the conditioned, to refuse to be tempted, that he is man. "In the image of God created He him." . . .

Thus according to the Jewish conception man is creature and creator at once. He is mere creature so long as, like a thing, he is thrust into action from without. He becomes creative when, liberating himself from the chains of alien force, he rises to the freedom of ethical action. . . .

We found the sense of the word "holy" therein that the Holy One subsists entirely within himself and that in untroubled security and clarity, without touching that confused way which is human fate, He creates righteousness. The *Kiddush Ha'Shem* is our aspiration toward this aim—that we experience the moral law no longer as a force that works upon us, but as the very essence of our being itself. By virtue of our conscience, Fichte once said, we are the citizens of another world. The *Kiddush Ha'Shem* signifies that we are to become rooted in that world of the absolute.

How are we in our very lives to bear witness to the fact that God is? This is that inclusive sense of the *Kiddush Ha'Shem* which has so deeply penetrated the consciousness of the Jewish people. God is the being who is self-determined unto any deed. Hence that life bears witness unto God which tears itself out of the texture of conditions and

of compromise and of vain considerations—the unconditioned life. Thus the sanctification of the name of God becomes a summons toward the heroic life. Historically the Jew conceived of the sacrifice of the sensual being, the death of the martyr, as the profoundest testifying to the reality of the unseen. And he did not shrink from this test. At the time of the Roman wars the number of those who gave up their lives for the sanctification of the name increased so greatly that our sages felt impelled to issue a warning and to determine precisely those few ultimate cases in which the Jew is bound to prefer death to a desecration of the name. But, it was added in a time of persecution, it was the Jew's duty to be so serious concerning the sanctification of the name that he must refuse to knot his shoestrings after the manner of the heathen.

But even as all the deep and fundamental Jewish concepts partake of the tragic polarity of the Jewish character, so, too, the *Kiddush Ha'Shem* has not escaped. The purest expression of the absoluteness of Jewish ethics, it acquired during the disintegration of our folk-ethos a secondary meaning which brought it down to a low level of the relative and the conditioned.

It is not to be denied that the bearing of witness to God's reality through ethical action is, above all, to take place before them to whom the God idea is alien. In this sense we find as early as in Ezekiel the command to sanctify the Name in the eyes of the heathen. But ethical action must not be dictated by the presence or observation of non-Jews. This, alas, is exactly what happened as the ethos of the Jews fell to a lower level and as the relation of the people to non-Jews lost both dignity and sincerity. The name and the action lost their heroic tone. Every kind word concerning Judaism which could be uttered before non-Jews was falsely called a *Kiddush Ha'Shem*. A Hebrew greeting to a ruler, a distinction or title won by a Jew, a condescension to Jews on the part of the powerful of the world—all these trivialities were named with the great

phrase of old. . . . It was used to veil obsequiousness and humiliation until a generation arose that had forgotten both the meaning and the words.

It is for us to renew the old meaning of this great word. The way is pointed out to us by that mighty ethical movement among the Jewish people of this age which we call the Zionist movement. . . . Put away from you all half-measures, all compromise, all opportunism; be *whole* upon your ways; renew yourselves out of the spirit of an absolute stringency in order that God may become to you once more what He was to Moses—a consuming flame.

Zionism is our *Kiddush Ha'Shem*.

III

Pesach and the People of This Time

Throughout history there are certain eternal themes or ideas which always return or, rather, are reconquered in an ever-renewed conflict by successive generations. Wherever men strive whole-heartedly after the reconquest of such ideas the process of history liberates itself from space and time and becomes the permanent symbol of humanity. Such a theme is presented by Pesach, the feast of freedom.

But even as every age has its own Torah—a legend tells us that Moses heard Rabbi Akiba interpret his own teaching and could not understand the interpretation—so likewise every generation of Jews has its own *Hagadah*. The eternal theme of liberation appears to each age in a new light. It is a great word that has been handed down to us: each generation must feel as though itself had been brought forth out of Egypt. And to each generation the exodus symbolizes a different aspect. To one the symbol of its being may be the sudden miracle, to another the destruction of the enemy, to a third the fortitude of the enslaved descendants of Jacob. What does the exodus mean to us?

In order to obtain a clear answer we must place Zionism

where it belongs—within the total intellectual movement of this age. It is only one of the many waves that beat today against the shore of life. If anyone desires to grasp the movement which we Jews call Zionism in its universal significance, it would be just to define it as a striving for human renewal according to the spirit. When we have said that, we have sufficiently characterized the actual epoch in which we live and against which we fight—the epoch of the denial of the spirit, of materialism in its broadest sense.

There is a deeply moving passage in the Zohar in which it is said of the worshippers of the golden calf, that their sin consisted in substituting for the eternally hidden and eternally to be sought subject of the universe a mere visible and tangible object, an empirical “these” when they cried: “these be thy gods, O Israel!”

An exclusive faith in the sensuously tangible is the essential mark of our age. It reveals itself in a thousand forms. Let us illustrate the materialism of our age at the point which concerns us here: its relation to human action. For Pesach is the feast of the liberating deed.

Have you ever seen a billiard ball that rolls of itself? No, you must admit that the cue must strike it before it rolls. Hence—thus reasons the materialism of our time to which men are like billiard balls—hence it is not possible that man can determine his action from within and all that is called self-determination, freedom of action, is in truth nothing but a compulsion from without. It is something that happens to us. We do not act; we are acted upon. . . .

In brief, our time is obsequious before the successful deed but does not understand the deed itself. Where within our civilization there seems to be the strongest will toward rebuilding and conversion, namely in the labor movements, precisely there the theoretical folly of our time has substituted blind fatality for the human will. It is not the will of man that will bring about a better age;

it is the "necessary action of economic forces"; it all works by itself. To the man of our time everything happens of and by itself. Just as the doctrine of evolution, that *deus ex machina* of all our thinking, succeeded all by itself in turning an ape into a man, so it will continue to take care of us. One fine day we shall awaken in Paradise.

That is, of course, an easy way. But our time has elevated the saving of time and trouble almost to the dignity of a moral law. The command to waste no energy has become a universal principle. Whoever still doubts that the so-called scientific period has been a wretched one for human beings as such has but to remember that at the beginning of the nineteenth century we had Kant's categorical imperative and that today we have the principle of the saving of energy even when it comes to thinking . . . I do not deny that the demand for an economy of energy can achieve much that is useful. Organizations are useful and so are charts and graphs and card-catalogues. But do you not see that all your card-catalogue wisdom will be self-annihilating? All that you register and prepare scientifically is in the end only human action. But action will cease if you choose the line of least resistance as your moral law. The fact that the science of our time can give the individual so pitifully little arises from its wrong relation to action. The cause is often sought for in overspecialization. But why have these manifold activities no unity? Because the spirit has been expelled. For all oneness has its source in the subject, call it reason, call it *logos*, call it what you will. But science has reached the point of seeing only objects in the world. It takes the world "as given." Scientists once knew that science is and can be nothing else than the spirit of man coming into a full consciousness of itself or, perhaps, the disengaging and redemption of mind from the world. Science once knew that. It has been forgotten. Do you want a crass example? Take the various phases of experimental psychology. It seeks to reduce the entire human spirit to sensation. Why?

That has deeper roots than the psychologists themselves know. Because they want to turn the human soul itself into a thing, an object and so they select sensation as being the most object-like human characteristic, most accessible and tangible and—least experienced. And these are your Gods!

What has all this to do with Pesach and with Zionism? A great deal! A recent translator of the Upanishads has appealed to a light from the East against the intellectual distraction of our time. Now we who are people of this time which we must combat—we too must turn for light to the East, to our light from our East if we are to sustain ourselves against the allurements and the misguidedness of this present. And it is very alluring, for what is more comfortable than this life with its morality of intellectual sloth and irresponsibility?

Against this sodden comfort we appeal to our Judaism which is a will toward action. At the origin of our history we have placed a deed of liberation, even as at the origin of human history we have placed the free decision and choice between good and evil. Read once more the history of Moses and the people with its endless conflicts between the leader and the mass, and you will say: here is our conflict and our fight against sloth and self-sufficiency. There were the comfortable ones who infinitely preferred the making of bricks and the mixing of mortar, the sure trough of the slave to the dangerous and uncertain path of freedom. And there was Moses who brought to them the gospel of freedom and of action. In the first revelation that came to him the divine made itself known to him as an "I am." God is an "I," and man who is His image, who is to be like Him and to be holy must awaken the "I" within himself. And in the first commandment of the Decalogue God again reveals Himself as He who has been the liberator from the house of bondage. We must be very careful not to conceive of this liberation superficially. It is a question of something far beyond a political liberation; it concerns

the struggle of action against rigid being and mere happening; it concerns the contradiction between willing and drifting, between decision and sloth, between daring and static cowardice. The conflict between Moses and the people is the conflict between spirit and matter.

Once more we stand within this conflict. Once more we must risk our lives in order to win them. And we are slaves even as we were in Egypt. Slaves of the empirical, of compromise, of unverity—men of this time. Will we stand the test that we must stand? Let us not forget that a good part of the mechanization of our life has been the work of Jews. The Jews by abandoning themselves, by shifting their centre of equilibrium to the world without, degraded themselves to billiard balls of which the fate is the cue's thrust. And after having depersonalized themselves as a people they used their Jewish energy to co-operate in making an alienation from the spirit the regnant view of life.

It is for this reason that Zionism—the struggle of those capable of spiritual decision against the slothful and the drifters—is an undertaking so eminently ethical in character. If it were possible to liberate the Jews from the cage of this period and teach them once more to bear responsibility and to act according to their inner monitions, then, I have faith to believe, the curse of this time will be taken from us.

Like all our fellow-men we are caught in a web of conditions and of opportunisms. Let us resist them and demand once more an unconditioned and a liberating deed by which we can be freed from the fetters of time and circumstance. . . .

Judaism is the will toward ethical action. Zionism is the form of Judaism which can save the Jews of this age.

ARNOLD ZWEIG

The name of Arnold Zweig is internationally known as that of the author of *The Conflict about Sergeant Grisha* and other brilliant and successful novels. What is not generally known is that he has been consciously and creatively Jewish from the beginnings of his career on and was given the Kleist prize in 1920 for a drama *Die Sendung Semaels* (*The Mission of Semael*) in which he treated the notorious ritual murder accusation made in the Hungarian town of Tisza-Eszlár. Many of his other stories and plays deal with Jewish subjects and he has been for many years ideologically if not politically allied with the Zionist movement.

He is finally the author of two works that deal exclusively with the Jewish problem and the Jewish rebirth, a later and slighter one: *Herkunft und Zukunft* (*Origin and Future*), two essays "on the destiny of a people" (1929) and an earlier and more elaborate one: *Caliban, oder Politik und Leidenschaft* (*Caliban or Politics and Passion*), 1927, which is, to use the further legend on the title-page, "an essay concerning the passions of human groups as illustrated by anti-Semitism." *Caliban* is quite irrespective of its precise subject matter and quite irrespective of its necessary starting-point, namely German anti-Semitism, an achievement of first-rate importance. Its methodology in the investigation of social psychology and its results are both epoch-making. Applying the general method of Freud and fortifying it with the novelist's insight into human character and motive, Zweig lays bare with exquisite and unerring precision all the infinite ramifications of the social and individual psychology involved on the part of both anti-Semite and Jew. His method,

widely used, would reorganize the whole field of sociology and social psychology, and it is a misfortune to science and mankind that sociologists are likely to be prevented from studying *Caliban* by the at once amusing and tragic circumstance that it deals with a specific subject which most people, including sociologists, desire either to "repress" or are unable to approach without an antecedent emotional prejudice.

Zweig was born in Glogau in Silesia in 1887. He fought with the German armies on the eastern front. Not overwhelmed by the German catastrophe which he had more or less foreseen for years, he sent his family to Palestine in 1932, whither he followed to take up his definitive residence a year later.

ARNOLD ZWEIG

I

Ultimate Causes

LET us begin by recording the fact, reserving for later an analysis of the reasons, the final significance and the resultant problem, that every people lives differently from every other by the naked circumstance of developing its own speech and faith and customs and hopes and ideals and even moral systems, even though these be differentiated only by shadings that result from variedly distributed accentuations of preference or the reverse. Since we stand, after all, only at the beginning of systematic scientific knowledge, later centuries will be wiser in these matters than ourselves. When philology, for instance, will be able really to ascertain the causes of sound changes and dialect formations within a language, we may perhaps have more than mere suppositions or hypotheses in our field too. But that the transforming forces of a given land have something to do with this is perhaps even today more than a mere supposition. The land, this fragment of the earth's surface, isolated both by nature and by human feeling, has a shaping influence upon the folk that has possessed and colonized it. Wherever a folk, namely a group united by origin and blood, accomplishes the mystery of taking possession, *there* it is at home and elsewhere in exile. Each people believes to have received its earth, its soil, from its gods or God; it perceives with veneration the formative forces, both psychical and physical, which brood

over the land and in every age of profound experience conceives of its gods as the masters of the land and of itself only as dweller, trustee, and guardian. . . . For this reason the destroying conqueror of a land is never at home in it; therefore the Turks were never at home either on the Balkans or in Palestine. One must say "home" in order to hear the vibrations of the inherent forces of a country. Exile, this antithesis of home, therefore, signifies for the stranger the tragic condition of being cut off from the shaping forces of his own land. Wherever a fragment of a folk takes root away from home, its character undergoes change because it has begun to yield to the shaping *daimon* of the foreign land. When, however, a people denies itself to the strange land and its *daimon*, when it clings with passionate tenacity to its kind and character, then it not only remains estranged, but has the will so to remain. In this circumstance the revulsion that accompanies the perception of difference will have a cruel sharpness. For the native folk feels itself to be negated and maltreated in its exercise of its predominant creative powers, since at least here, upon its own soil, it cannot but ascribe to itself and all its ways and modes of being a preferableness and absolute desirability. It is profoundly conscious of the oneness of itself and its land and feels wounded in this oneness of its being—all the more deeply wounded when the stranger is not a mere sojourner but a permanent dweller; all the more incomprehensibly wounded when the stranger appears not with the attributes of strength, vitality, and conquering power, but seems in respect of all *these* attributes manifestly inferior to the people of the land. In such a case the persistence of the sojourner seems to issue a challenge, his strangeness becomes repulsive, the autochthonous folk imperiously demands a healing of the breach and issues the order that the obtrusive stranger sink into unobtrusiveness. In such cases the imagination of the folk becomes active; it imagines that unholy forces protect the tenacious outlander; it distorts him unendurably; it denies

the common human bond between him and itself; the equivocal becomes gruesome and whatever is not familiar is interpreted as monstrous. Now nothing seems harmless any more and nothing even ridiculous; nothing breaks through the bitter murk of hostility. When, finally and above all, the stranger, the different one, denies the highly valued institutions, goods or ideals of the native ruling folk by his mere demeanour or even by positive expression—then the repulsion which among men accompanies the perception of difference is transformed into corrosive hatred. This is the case of the Jews.

Next we must ask, of course, whether the Jews are still a people in the sense used and implied here. Many western Jews deny this loudly and cling to the fact that determining external characteristics cannot be mathematically defined. To be sure, they are the only ones who deny it, and all they disclaim is the concept "people." They prefer to call themselves a race or an historic community or a religious community. They like best of all to negate any inclusive differentiation of themselves and assert that they have left all such things behind them, that they are just human or else Germans or Frenchmen, part of the people of the state in which they have taken root. And many of these are profoundly sincere. But the names by which men call their special bindings matter very little. A people actually dies when the great majority of its descendants are either dead and buried or have disappeared. Not before! The Etruscans and the Goths are dead. But the Jews exist, fifteen millions of them, the Jews who within historic times constituted a folk with its own speech, land, ethos, creativity and God and whose undeniable descendants live everywhere today, characterized by an unmistakable average similarity of body and of soul, with a history that has no gaps, with a unique tradition, with a will toward a life of its own, with folk-masses, finally, whose will toward

being a folk has never lost its instinctive matter-of-course-ness and whose unfaltering desire for its own land has been compelled by outer forces only to assume the form of a religious or nationalistic idealism. A group that lives thus is a people, however unpleasant the fact may be to certain members of that people. The nations very properly disregard the discomfort and the subtleties of these few and call this particular spade by its right name. They do this quite instinctively wherever they perceive a community of Jews. Single individuals or even a few scattered families may be permitted to pass unnoticed from the point of view of their folk-character. They are perceived to be strangers, but habit and familiarity can smooth the situation. Only in the presence of groups of sojourners are those realities emphasized which lead to the necessary perception of other origin, character, life-forms and the inherent affirmations and negations. Therefore the hostile perception of difference is conditioned upon the appearance of a number of Jews; the greater this number the more sharply is their differentiation from others defined and the more powerfully is the resultant hostility provoked. Wherever this hostility has once flared up it hardly ever dies again, and even after the emigration or death or assimilation or extermination of the hated group isolated individuals may still become the objects of that hostility so long as they bear even the faintest marks of that perished people.

The emotion of hostility that arises in connexion with the perception of the differentness of the Jewish people is what we call anti-Semitism. That this emotion is so unique and appears and is experienced in a manner so different from the hostilities that arise in the contacts of the Gentile peoples among each other must have its ultimate cause either in the strictly unique form in which the Jewish people is forced to appear on earth, or else in its peculiar being which is characterized by a very central differentness of this people from all other peoples.

And the Jews?

It may seem as though I were of the opinion that the Jews are wholly guiltless and as though I assigned to them the rôle of the lamb fallen among wolves, the lamb whose innocence cries out to heaven. . . . That is not quite correct. Anyone who seeks veraciously and objectively the roots of anti-Semitism and seeks to understand that phenomenon, as it were, out of itself, will inevitably come to the point where he must earnestly ask: And the Jews themselves? Whence comes the difference between the hostility which they arouse and that which the Bavarian feels toward the Prussian, the Frenchman toward the German, the white man toward the yellow or the black man? Have the Jews not always both by their psychical constitution and their national status (or want of it) inevitably provoked, however involuntarily, the morbid and over-ready sensitiveness of the nations? They have undoubtedly done so.

First of all these people, whom queerly enough their foes dub nomads, have clung with inconceivable tenacity to the lands of their direst persecution. Driven forth, they have returned so soon as it was permitted them to the old cities and settlements. They found it hard to forget the scenes of their one-time well-being, and it had always gone well with them everywhere in the beginning when they were but few . . . and also because the strength to endure seemed to them to stream from any earth that held the bones of their fathers and their martyrs; finally, because they kept hoping for better times and a gradual enlightenment of the peoples, but above all perhaps . . . because they would not be disobedient to their God who had set them in these lands. . . . Thus the Jews remained in the lands that were not theirs, and while the other peoples became transformed they too underwent changes but far

less obtrusively, for at the kernel of their lives remained a constant element: the letter of the Law as well as a portion of its spirit.

They retained their communal structures. But these too disintegrated as time gnawed away the substance of religion in the soul. Meanwhile they permitted their outer lives to be more and more dictated by the hostile tendencies of their environment. And they would have had to be of a superhuman patience, purity, and humanity had they, after their gigantic sufferings, not answered hostility by hostility. Their weapon was an economic weapon, the only one that had been left them—one, in truth, that had been violently thrust upon them: money. It took a thousand years of martyrdom before they used even this weapon, for there is no mention or reproach of an economic nature in all the vast anti-Jewish literature between antiquity and the twelfth Christian century. . . . It is not astonishing that, as Werner Sombart has proved, they treated creatively this occupation which had been thrust upon them and had their large share in the upbuilding of the modern capitalistic order. For they have always been creative in all matters and prone to extremes in good as in evil, never slack, mediocre or merely imitative. And since they lived in a wolfish world they came to share its wolfishness, despite the ceaseless monitions and accusations of their teachers and sages who dwelt unceasingly in their midst and as unceasingly sought to keep alive the humane and merciful spirit of the Law. . . .

What in this process happened to the Jew? In what recognizable *form* does he face today the instincts of his deepest being and the magnificent spiritual creation which is still his own and which represents the core of his historic experience—the words of Moses and the prophets, the figure of Jesus and the first Christians, the tireless monitions of so many saints and sages, the genius of the Chasidic movement, the loving and lovable temper of *Zedakah* which even to this day is visibly alive here and there in

the world? In no visible and recognizable form at all. That is the utter depth of his tragedy. Even to us in whose indignation burns the fire of solidarity and oneness he has become, as it were, invisible and intangible. Only the orthodox Jew, if he is wholly so and from within presents not only in the Jewish aspects of his life, but also in his pervasive righteousness, the recognizable image of a human type. How many such remain today? . . . And the other Jews—atoms of ever-changing structure—how are we to recognize them, how group them, how define that which unites them? Conservative and aristocrat, liberal and democrat, revolutionary and socialist, capitalist and petit bourgeois, scientist, artist, religious—in all these modern human forms the Jew has hidden himself and caused all the lineaments of his own character to become dissolved and has absorbed all the attitudes of the ruling people of his land even to a nationalist unawareness of himself and his people. . . . Where shall we look in our search for genuine Jews today?

A warning must be interpolated here and a standard indicated. If we measure the Jew by the same standard that we apply to the other peoples, no one has the right to accuse him—no one at all! Has the Jew violated the commandment, Thou shalt not steal? The others have stolen on a vaster scale and finally during the four years of the World War stripped clean of gear and goods whole countries and laid them waste by fire and destruction and actual robbery, including all the centres of Jewish life in the east of Europe. They left famine and desolation behind them and reduced life to savagery. And all that they did with the righteous aspect of foulest hypocrisy, of livid untruth. They did what Jews have never done. In the interest of certain classes they drove hundreds of thousands of their fellow men into shambles to be slaughtered like beasts and so ruthlessly accustomed the populations entrusted to their care to murder, plunder, lies, and lust that the contemporary average European lives ethically

on a pre-Noachic level and has no qualms concerning his condition. But we measure the Jew by the standard which he himself has created and brought into the world, by the laws of that moral and religious life which he lived empirically and actually so long as he was a Jew and nothing but a Jew. We assess him by the light of the radiance of his own genius which still shines over the Western world. And even as one measures the worth of a Shakespearian play or of a German symphony, or of an Italian or French painting or of an antique Greek statue by the values which these works themselves embody, even so we regard the Jew from within that law of life which he himself once created and within which he once lived. For the moment we can even leave aside the moral and creative values which this life and its law represented and endlessly enriched by its demands; we emphasize here merely the intense impulse toward living within a Jewish community, bound by Jewish bindings, Jews without question, recognizable before God and man by law, speech, custom and an undying relationship to the ancestral land. It was not so long ago that Jews considered it a matter of course and the unquestionable foundation of life that they were to live effectively within their folk: to eat bread of wheat raised by Jewish farmers, ground by a Jewish miller, baked by a Jewish baker, to dwell in houses built by Jewish hands on Jewish land, to trade with Jews and to regard mercifully as their own the Jewish poor of the Jewish land or the Ghetto alley. This alone seemed life in the order of nature and their present estate mere perversion and exile—the doom due to apostasy and *averah*, the symbol of God's wrath and Israel's sin.

And to the Western Jew of today this unnatural condition seems natural, not to be questioned, and that other life a dead unrelated historic fact, and any wish to return to it a curiosity or even a source of indignation. When this Jew thinks of a judge or justice, he visualizes the magistrate and courts and codes of his dwelling-place

and has quite forgotten the fact that his Reform rabbi is not a pastor at all and was through the ages a judge, and that *his* code of law is recorded in the Talmud and its commentaries, a work which, if he knows of it at all, he regards as a religious document. Such is the modern Western Jew's plain reality and norm and simple rightness of life today. To live wholly with the peoples of the West as a true and loyal citizen of his state—such is his whole existence. Without any inner uncertainty, without the faintest presage of the unnaturalness of it, we give ourselves unreservedly to the public life of our state and are, at most, Jews at home, *if* even there! And yet—and yet we propagate ourselves as Jews, we reckon ourselves among Jews as members of a community somehow bound together. It does not matter whether we call the binding principle religion, race, blood, descent, spirit, folk, fate or nation—that active binding principle exists and lives somehow even in the most estranged of Jews, even in his baptized children of mixed blood, even in his children's children! Well, if this uncanny equivocal doubleness, if this twofold formlessness, if this ungraspable division is not calculated to arouse suspicion, disquiet, and repulsion—what is? What is?

III

The Inner Tragedy

Anti-Semitism reveals its most shocking reality as a Jewish life problem. I do not wish to be counted among the praisers of the Ghetto which always infused into the totality of Jewish feeling an element of the perverse, the evil, the degrading. Yet it is not to be denied that the vitally functioning *Kehillah* did somehow provide the Jew with a place where tension ceased. War was not universal for him. Within his city there was an area including his house which constituted a zone of armistice in which the

self-affirmative feelings so vital to both individuals and groups could rest from their irritations and be healed of their wounds.

Since the emancipation not only has that zone of quiet been abolished but the defensive position of the Jew has assumed the form of the more open economic warfare for naked life itself. The Ghetto was not felt as competitive. Now the non-Jews, the people of the land, overwhelming in strength by virtue of numbers, of being the lawmakers, of having antecedently in their hands all sources of production opened an offensive to rob the Jews of those economic rights and opportunities that had been accorded them on paper. Yet it must not be overlooked that the Gentile had the feeling as though the Jew by entering his world at all was attacking *him*. The Gentiles regarded the Jews who suddenly appeared in their very midst with concepts, categories, and knowledge so much older, with mentality so much more mature, almost as adolescents would regard an adult armed with resources of mind and knowledge which they wholly lack. The lower middle classes regard the Jew in that light to this day. He troubles them by his mere existence. He is older than they are and seems cleverer; he seems infinitely experienced and disagreeably subtle; his amusements and his very jests, his literary and artistic tastes, are so much riper or, let us say simply, older than their own. Thus they feel him as shadow, burden, obstacle to be escaped, thrown off, opposed. A situation arises like that at the inception of some modern war: both parties are convinced that they are attacked, that the opponent is the offender. But the non-Jew, though he may believe himself aggrieved, becomes the aggressor and foe by the mere fact of his overwhelming initial superiority in might. It is this superiority in might which destroys the ethical character of even the genuine feelings of the convinced anti-Semite.

The Jew is, of course, massively aware of the defensive character of his total existence. The might of the majority

overwhelms him and towers like a wall. In order to live at all and in order to obey the law of all life toward some expansion, well-being, success, he must breach the wall that surrounds him. He naturally uses the weapon which his long dependence on reason and his physical weakness permits him to use, and he uses it with the subtlety of one to whom the economic order is less mysterious. And money is the idol of the peoples. So he uses it. Yet he feels vibrant against him the contemptuous perception of his differentness. How does he armour himself against that? In various ways that are decisive for his character. Commonly he uses sincerely enough the argument that he is a member of the peoples and differs by nothing but his creed; he uses the necessary humility of the weak and offers excuses for his burdened being. Instead of facing the fact that a hostile perception of his difference is a fundamental fact of average Gentile consciousness, he argues feebly that it *ought* not to be. But it is, obviously enough! And it is utterly futile to protest against it. Yet it never occurs to him to transcend it by understanding it. Despite his protest he knows well enough, of course, that he lives in a state of involuntary conflict with his whole world. Once upon a time he carried on this conflict with the strength of contemptuous pride; to the hostile perception of his differentness his soul answered with an affirmation of his worth. He said "goyim"—an expression of incomparable pregnancy—and remained erect. Nor was this all. The Jewries of the world were interwoven like a net. This fact was his consolation and his strength. For he who can count on the solidarity of his kind has that within wherewith to resist the contempt of a hostile world. He who is not alone is stronger by that very fact.

It is this condition that has tragically changed. Loud and vulgar anti-Semitism has intimidated a large part of Jewry to such a point of abjectness through the stupid reproach of lack of patriotism that this part dares no longer to oppose to the international conspiracies of its enemies

the defence of common action crossing the national state boundaries. Now it is precisely this degree of feebleness and fear that international anti-Semitism consciously desires to bring about. And it has succeeded in the case of those many Jews who today, though they may deny it, have almost come to share their foes' estimate of them. These Jews stand naked and defenceless against the world. First they abandoned their religious and next their historic bindings; they have accepted the curse pronounced upon them. The feebleness of such Jews is intensified by their moral isolation. That they are many does not help any individual. For it is their very interpretation of their Jewishness that isolates them. Subtly this type consents to the estimate of himself as physically and morally inferior and hence is always trying to justify himself by proving his harmlessness or usefulness as a fellow citizen. It is this man who wants to be "tolerated." Now if he has the unhappiness of coming from a home that is neither orthodox nor Zionist nor even pervasively though undefinably Jewish; when, moreover, as happens so often he protests against all things specifically Jewish, against all that seems to divide him from the world—in that case he has no inner source of strength that he can mobilize against the world's subtle or coarse hostility; then nothing is left him except an appeal to the feeling of justice of his masters, a feeling necessarily corrupted by need and passion or, last of all, such small self-affirmation as he may pump up from his narrowly individual self-esteem. And this is small indeed, for it is universally corroded by traumas of the unconscious suffered during childhood.

Here we touch upon the sorest, the most acutely vulnerable spot of our people which the anti-Semite has succeeded in reaching with his knife. Attacks on property or position are of minor importance. It is true that we are a poor people. The moneyed Jewish bourgeoisie fades into insignificance by comparison with our eternally and tragically impoverished masses. As a whole the Jewish people

belongs among the most bitterly exploited on earth. Let that pass! Our tragedy in this age is the wound which anti-Semitism inflicts upon the very substance of the Jewish soul, upon the spiritual and so the physical health of each generation of Jewish children—upon the integrity and future of our people.

IV

Rebirth

That the closing of the doors of America and the opening of those of Palestine was all but simultaneous belongs among those providential happenings of which Jewish history is not wholly devoid. This opening of the gate of Palestine was an achievement that had from the beginning been the goal of the Jewish national rebirth, of political Zionism. It now entered the phase of reality. For the first time in centuries this Zionism proclaimed the fact that the Jews are a people and demanded the erection of a national home in Palestine for all those Jews who supremely affirmed the permanence of the Jewish element in history. Hence it was from the start the reorganization of Jewishness *within* the Jew.

It is not to be denied that the Zionistic impulse was vivified by the penultimate phase of militant European nationalism. Without the experiences of anti-Semitism of his student years and later of the Dreyfus case, its founder, Theodor Herzl, might have remained a Viennese columnist and half-forgotten man. But Gentile resistance could neither then nor at any other time supply more than an impulsion from without. It shook the vessel. That the Jewish fluid within crystallized or coagulated was due wholly to its saturation with the inner forces toward re-Judaization. Moses Hess, Leon Pinsker, Nathan Birnbaum, Achad Ha'Am had done their work. . . . For him who is so united to his being within the being of the Jew-

ish people that its preservation is mere axiom and matter of course, Zionism is a fact so simple and inevitable that he finds it difficult to explain. He needs neither reason nor excuse. To him Zionism is the tendency to normalize the condition of the Jews in the world. It aims to bring about a life of Jews among Jews, which shall run the course of a normal society and possess the security of its natural stratifications, so that even conflict between class and class, as well as all the frictions of the economic order, shall take place among Jews without that super-heating of the surfaces of friction inevitable in a mixed society. Thus it enables the Jewish people to give a natural expression of the laws of life in their Jewish manifestation. Zionism has done more. It has transformed the literary and sacramental Hebrew language into the living folk-speech of a community of over 300,000 souls (1935) and at the same time it has caused Hebrew and its influence to radiate forth from its Palestinian centre and rebeget this immemorial bearer of the Jewish spirit in an entire generation of our youth all over the world. Everywhere, moreover, Zionism has given to tens of thousands of Jews spiritual erectness and a way of affirming their Jewishness and reintegrating themselves with it that is modern and comprehensible. It recreated (literally!) universal Judaism in that it revalued Judaism in the form of a national enthusiasm for Jewish spirit and being and thus made of these a desirable and elevating fact of consciousness. It supplied all Israel with new banners and principles and the resultant conflicts poured into the stagnant atmosphere streams of life-giving fire. It compelled the Jews who affirmed Zionism to great and unselfish economic achievements and hence set for them a healing super-individual goal. Since, moreover, all that was achieved lagged behind the necessities of the situation the movement has been saved from the curse of pride. Nor was this all. The service of Zionism to the neglected ideal of bodily strength and perfection, by which it allied countless Jews to the modern and neo-humanistic

culture of the physical—this alone would suffice to make the movement worthy of lasting honour. It proved to the world that the age-old Ghetto life had not been able to extirpate manly strength and sportsmanship among the Jewish people; at the same time this development took place in a calm and natural way in that it largely confined competitive sports within Jewish organizations and thus eliminated the coarseness of fear and hate.

Among the further merits of the Zionist movement are that it created a youth movement and thus rendered decisive service toward the noble re-Judaizing of new generations and, perhaps above all, in that it turned the interest of Jews in all countries and through the media of the languages which they spoke to a new and active participation in the entire world of the Jewish spirit. All phases of our antique and mediæval thought and poetry and myth, all forms of our continuous interpretation of man and his world and God were brought to the people in admirable translations and thus revealed to those whose need was so sore and whose knowledge so small the whole historic and spiritual and creative world of their people. The translations of Bin Gorion-Berdiczewsky, of Martin Buber, Franz Rosenzweig, Jacob Frommer, the great histories of Dubnow, the many anthologies of Jewish poetry and wisdom, the translations of the eminent modern Yiddish and Hebrew men of letters—Perez, Bialik, Schneur, Mendele, Sholem Alechem and Sholem Asch—the new Jewish stages from the Vilna Group to the Habima, the renewed interest in all chief cities in Jewish music—all these things bore witness to a true Jewish renaissance. Innumerable Jewish individuals completely absorbed hitherto in the life and literature of their adopted lands experienced an extraordinary renewal and reorientation of their conscious culture. By creating a Jewish school with Hebrew as the language of instruction the Zionist movement also fortified the inner life of a generation of children destined otherwise to develop wholly in an atmosphere of hostility and

hate. But its greatest achievement was this: to countless scattered Jews and Jewish families things Jewish ceased to seem, as under alien pressure they had hitherto done, subtly ignoble. Shame in oneself—that most infamous result of anti-Semitism—was first transformed into pride and gradually into a calm reintegration of Jewish souls with their proper life. . . .

These cultural and spiritual triumphs culminated in an overwhelmingly practical one. During the World War itself was issued that declaration of the right of the Jews to the land of their fathers and their origin which bears the name of a great British statesman and thinker, Arthur Balfour. From the hour of that declaration on a new spirit of life came to animate the Jewish people. And it was again characteristic of the history and character of Israel that it owed this sign and presage of rebirth and fulfilment to a writer named Nahum Sokolow and to a "Jew from Pinsk" who was later to be a professor of chemistry at the University of Manchester, Dr. Chaim Weitzmann—and not to any millionaire or general or trafficker in material goods.

JACOB KLATZKIN

The philosopher and publicist Klatzkin was born in White Russia in 1882. He was one of the editors of *Die Welt* in the years after Herzl's death and for some time director of the *Keren Kayemeth*, the Jewish National Fund, in Cologne. He edited a Jewish paper in Switzerland, founded a Hebrew publishing house in the same country and later the "Eshkol" publishing house in Berlin for which he edits the magnificent *Encyklopædia Judaica*, of which nine volumes have appeared. He has written fiction and philosophy chiefly in Hebrew, and translated the *Ethics* of Spinoza into that language. His central works are two: *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum* (*Crisis and Decision of the Jewish People*), 1921, and *Shekiat Hachayim* (*Setting of Life*), 1925.

Klatzkin is an *absolute* Zionist. His negation of the *Galuth* is philosophically and practically total. His desire is that by all possible ethical means and by exerting the entire energy of the Jewish people everywhere millions of them are to be brought to Palestine and the contiguous lands to form a solid mass as soon as possible and regardless of all other considerations, and that that minority which will not or cannot follow the call shall then assimilate by intermarriage (always easier when and where Jews are few) and disappear as Jews. Thus there will be a Jewish people in the Near East and no Jewish problem left anywhere. This view of his is philosophically grounded in that he admits as criteria of a people's being *only* speech and soil and denies that Jews or any other group, for that matter, can live healthily or highly by playing at having this or that *content* as proof of their peoplehood when they have not the necessary containers (speech and soil)

for any content. Klatzkin is a passionate and intrepid spirit. His arguments may wound and shock. Many of them are irrefutable. In his Hebrew works he has elaborated a vitalistic total philosophy as groundwork for his Zionist politics. The following extract is from *Crisis and Decision*, 2nd ed.

JACOB KLATZKIN

The Heroic Life

ONE of the most imperious demands of this hour in the history of the Jewish people is the vigorous manifestation of our national nature and will. This necessity of a positive character contains another and negative necessity, namely the disavowal of assimilation as an essential unverity. . . . We must, above all else, fight for our recognition and valuation as a living organism or people which is neither ready nor able to give up its distinctive character but must preserve it even at the cost of disadvantages and burdens.

Moses Mendelssohn once wrote: "If civic rights are to be obtained only on condition of our being disobedient to that Law which we still regard as binding, then we must, however sorrowfully, decline these civic rights. For in this matter the decision is not within our power." We must in this age make a similar declaration in regard to our tacit and open demand to be regarded as a people.

We must shrink from none of the consequences of this necessity. Our loyalty to ourselves and our truth must be open and complete. . . . For consider the degeneration which our instincts as a people have reached! . . . Was it not but the other day that Jews and even Zionists rejoiced when warring empires or imperialist democracies proclaimed that henceforth within their boundaries they would acknowledge only "Germans" or only "Frenchmen"? Ought we not to have replied to those self-seeking mottoes: "And Jews? Are there no Jews? Do you *not* want us *as such*?"

Hence the deep unveracity of all these Jewish "heroes" in alien pagan wars. What has the Jewish people to do with these decorations—these iron crosses or crosses of St. George or St. Anna? The Jewish people has no reason to distinguish these "heroes"; they are not Jewish heroes; they do not belong to us.

Long ago the champions of Jewish emancipation, both the Jewish and the Christian, wrote somewhat as follows of our "heroes" who had volunteered to fight in the armies of their lands: "Now we are fighting our way out of our quarter-citizenship, out of our wretched half-breed estate into the fulness of national standing and participation. Now we can show that we love the fatherland no less than others. We shall put forth all our strength to live and to die for our dear homeland and at the same time bring new honour unto the slandered name of our forbears. Now we will show them—those in both camps. . . ." Did these champions of our equal rights never become conscious of the fact that they betrayed our *Jewish* heroes? Of what ethical value is heroism practised for its own sake—a heroism of which the purpose is to show that one can be heroic, one that intends deliberately to impress others and thus gain complete citizenship—a heroism as purchase-price of equal rights?

During the World War the Jewish press reported many heroic deeds on the part of Jewish soldiers. There was a Jewish lad who, recognizing that the enemy he faced was a Jew, too, was taken aback and lowered his bayonet. But almost at once his "higher" duty flashed upon him and he slew the enemy forthwith. For this deed he was rewarded by the iron cross, second class. Another account told of a Jewish soldier who threw himself upon five suddenly discovered "enemies." He killed three; the other two he pursued and, having broken his bayonet in the murder of number four, throttled number five with his bare hands. . . . Jewish heroes?

Where was our antique Jewish heroism which openly

disdained the heroism of hate and murder? Where was that eternal gesture of the native nobility of the Jewish soul which would utterly repudiate this new kind of valour? When they flatter us, saying: the modern Jews have in this World War given a new lustre to the name of their ancestors, ought we not in pride and uprightness to reply: No, they have not cleansed the maligned names of our fathers. Our fathers' name stood in no need of cleansing. For they were far braver than their far progeny who, fearful of being dubbed cowards, show forth a pagan heroism. The reproach of cowardice left our fathers utterly unmoved. Their conception and feeling of honour rendered that reproach meaningless. They were equally steeled against all other imputations. They were ethically so far above their environment that these meaningless slanders could not hurt, could not even reach, them. And they regarded these wretched slanderers not only with scorn, but with compassion for their barbarous folly. They were, unlike their sons, neither fearful nor anxious to please; they did not tremble at the thought of the opinion of the world.

Ought not we nationalist Jews to seek to discredit this new virtue which the world has discovered in us and declare openly and frankly: The Jewish people has no reason to be proud of these heroes. They did not fight for the Jewish people. They fought for the German people; they fought for the French people. They did not fight the enemies of the Jewish people, either; they fought the enemies of Germany or of France. It could, in cold fact, be asserted that many of these heroes were traitors to their Judaism, who deserted us in our struggle for national existence, who abandoned flag and cause, Jewish deserters, in brief, flagrant assimilationists.

Nor is this all. Warlike valour is not a Jewish characteristic. It may be that, several thousand years ago, we were able fighters. But we have never glorified that aspect of our remote past. Do you remember Rashi's commentary on

the verse, "and Jacob was afraid"? . . . "He was afraid to kill and he was afraid of being killed." In the historic consciousness of our people glory is reserved to quite another heroism; it belongs to the deeds of our saints and sages.

We who are homeless can feel halfways at home in our exile only on a foundation of pacifism and high humanistic idealism. It is significant that amid the thousand insensate slanders directed against us one, at least, is lacking—the reproach of pugnacity. The ideology of war is wholly alien to us. We are at least today so constituted that we find it difficult to grasp the very fact of war. Genuine Jews face this phenomenon as something unfathomable; they have no insight into either the history or inner logic of the almost constant occurrence of international murder. We ought quite openly to declare that we lack warlike valour. We are in fact frightened of blood. We shrink in utter horror from the shedding of human blood. It is our religion, you see, which in the course of the many centuries has made such "cowards" and "weaklings" of us. Our prophets implanted in us an unconquerable reverence for our fellow man, the image of God; our sages taught us that all life is sacred and commanded us to be compassionate of all living things. It is not our fault that the sword in our hand trembles, that we are "soft of heart," that we cannot bring ourselves to inflict pain even on the beasts. It is to be remembered, after all, that for two thousand years we have forgotten the use of weapons. We are not trained in the trade of murder. The spears of tribesmen and the swords of knights were neither our weapons in the struggle for existence nor our pride. For two thousand years we have been passive onlookers on the wars of the world, unless we were persecuted and harried. For during all that period we have been weaponless and defenceless. How should we suddenly have come into the possession of a conspicuously military spirit?

No! Let us be frank and say to the peoples of Europe: If

in this war the Jews have indeed shown themselves to be heroes and if military heroism is indeed a virtue, then credit this virtue as shown by us to *your* civilization in which these Jewish soldiers grew up and to which they were wholly subject. Do not credit it to that Judaism from which they were estranged. Their military virtue was a purely assimilatory one, the mark and—if *you* like—the glory of their de-Judaization. The Jewish people wants neither their praise nor their fame. And if, finally, you were to say: now we have put aside our prejudices concerning the military inferiority of Jews, let us once again say: You have confirmed the fact that we are no longer true Jews and worthy of the fathers of our people.

True Judaism has other weapons and knows another field of honour—the stake of martyrdom. Judaism knows its own heroism well, a quiet heroism: death for faith and truth, death for the sanctification of the Name: the heroism of those Jews who, rather than deliver up an innocent man from their midst whom a mad mob feigned to be the slayer of a Christian child, went to the synagogue and all chose death rather than unrighteousness; the heroism of those children of ten, the *Nikolajewsky Soldaty* (Soldiers of Nicholas I) who during the twenty-five years of their military slavery were tortured in body and in soul in order to be induced to accept an alien faith and were steadfast—these Jewish children who resisted both the lure of favours and the blood-soaked whip, these little ones, these great martyrs whom the entire Russian Empire could not break. *These* are the Jewish soldiers in a foreign army who are our heroes. Or take those Jews of Kowno who in the year 1915, placed before the alternative of delivering up as hostages the leaders of their community or mass expulsion, chose the latter. Truly, the Jewish people knows a heroism of its own—the heroism of a little people that during two thousand years has been steadfast against a world of foes.

FRITZ BERNSTEIN

Concerning this Dutch sociologist no biographical data are available. His chief work was published by the Jüdischer Verlag of Berlin in 1926. Its title is *Der Antisemitismus als Gruppenerscheinung. Versuch einer Soziologie des Judenhasses* (Anti-Semitism as a Group Phenomenon. An Essay in the Sociology of Judæophobia). Ranking with Zweig's *Caliban* (*vide ante*) as one of the great sociological treatises of the age, this work is likely to be neglected by general sociologists for the same reason. Yet it may be soberly affirmed that Zweig and Bernstein throw more light on the processes of society and on the character of the behaviour of man in society than the portentous treatise of Pareto.

Bernstein's book, which is written with an almost Swifitean sobriety—*i.e.* with a great passion for truth held perfectly in leash—completely eliminates from group frictions and group enmities those rationalizations by which the various groups seek to explain their enmities by assigning to them historical and ethical causes. He derives these enmities from fundamental experiences induced in all men by human character and the character of life itself and with an unfaltering logic, a vital and not formal logic, describes the necessary form of that inter-group hostility between major and minor, dominant and subject groups. The cognitions thus attained he finally applies to the position of the Jew in the world and the specific group hatred known as anti-Semitism and thus establishes Zionist aspiration and work upon the hard ground of objective science.

FRITZ BERNSTEIN

I

The Sources of Human Hostility

It is necessary to remember that hatred is constantly in human society directed and discharged against persons who could not possibly have been guilty of causing it. . . .

We must disabuse ourselves of the common notion that feelings of hatred occur only as reactions toward injuries and are directed toward those who have inflicted them. We must remember that every human hurt or discomfort, no matter by whom it is caused or how, whether due to the guilt or the proper actions of another, whether caused by one's own fault or arising through no one's fault and through the action of no human agency, has the tendency to be transformed into an emotion of hostility, to be directed against fellow men and to express itself as enmity. . . .

All human pain is thus injected into human society in the form of hatred. *Enmity is pain projected upon fellow men.*

Let us now try to gain some precise insight into the mechanism of this process. The projection of hostile emotion upon people who are innocent of its origin offers no great difficulty. All that is needed is the illusory image of a guilt which the proposed objects of hatred may be feigned to have incurred. Whenever possible a fictive nexus is constructed between the origin of the human pain and a guilt on the part of the selected enemy. When this is not

possible the faults of the putative enemy that have no relation to the pain or hurt in question can be used as motivation and occasion. But the illusion of the so-called guilt of the selected object of hatred can arise as readily without any objective basis, since the enemy, having once been picked, can easily be accused of evil traits and wicked intentions.

The expression in active form of the feelings of hostility is a good deal harder. He who hates must have the power to inflict hurt, but the possibility of reprisal must be reduced to a minimum. Now he normally possesses such power in a very small degree while at the same time the pain which he needs to project on others is of overwhelming intensity. In our civilization organized justice through the courts will sometimes assuage the deepest hurts actually suffered. But all pain that arises from impersonal sources gets no assuagement at all. . . . Hence the great mass of pain and hurt inwardly converted into hostility against life and society normally finds no way of venting itself and is morosely stored up.

Modern psychology has taught us that the human psyche contains instincts and inclinations that are held in leash below the threshold of consciousness. But their power is not broken and they tend always to reappear in the conscious life. Thus all the resentments against life that are transformed into hostility are held in a kind of reservoir. . . .

Popular psychology, though generally without logic or coherence, is often very precise in its observation of detail. It corresponds to the process in question when people say that So-and-so has had to "swallow" a great deal, that, therefore, he is "fed up to the eyes," that finally he can "hold in" no longer and that he has to "get rid" of his rage and hate. This picture of the psychical mechanism in question is pretty accurate. All pains and hurts, irrespective of their origin, have the tendency to be transformed into hatred, and this hatred can normally find only the mildest

and most inadequate vent. Hence there are constantly present in man stored up masses of hostility which tempt him to wild and *random* expression of them so soon as a chance seems to present itself.

It goes without saying that this disposition differs in different individuals and that its intensity varies from epoch to epoch, even as sensibility to pain and the transformation of pain into emotion are not constant quantities. But the disposition itself is present in every human soul. Now let us assume that time and fate bring it about through abnormally high degrees of pain and rage and frustration that the feelings of hostility into which these are transformed rise so high in that inner psychical reservoir that none of the ordinary vents suffice and a catastrophic outburst and flood take place. What will take place then is this: that all hidden and irrational fears and hates will be hurled forth to the surface of the psyche and thus it comes about that extraordinary circumstances will bring into the light of day extraordinary quantities of unexpected and half-unknown enmities and bestial impulses.

Since—let this fact be emphasized—man always carries in his subconsciousness stored-up masses of hatred, these feelings can rarely if ever be adequately vented against the persons who have aroused them or who may be, however fancifully, in any true fashion connected with them. Thus the sudden possibility or overwhelming necessity for the expression of hatred will almost regularly direct that hatred toward objects used as mere pretexts or occasions. The nature of these pretexts and the character of the object can be explained without difficulty. But so much must be clear already: the expression of stored-up individual and group hatreds (transformed pains, hurts, humiliations, frustrations) almost never bears any direct relation to even its putative causes. It is for this reason that outbursts of group hostility normally seem aimless and perverse to those not affected by them, that they are dangerous since, being normally directed against the innocent, they

arouse defensive hatreds, and that they are madly excessive since they are the result of long accumulations of repressed ferocities.

II

Racial Anti-Semitism

The conjunction of "racial" with "anti-Semitism" has been built up in the modern specifically anti-Semitic literature, the aim of which has been to establish the inferiority of the Semitic, specifically the Jewish, race in order to justify or rationalize its antecedent hatred. On this point the following observations are still to be made.

In all group antagonisms each group brands the other or hostile group as inferior. It has remained for the anti-Semites to extend this melancholy human characteristic into a pseudo-scientific system. But the phenomenon is not difficult to explain. For in spite of all collisions of taste or interest that may arise in the normal social contacts between Jews and non-Jews, little or no adequate cause for hostility ever arises from these. That is not true because the Jews are an abnormally excellent people; it is true because, being everywhere a feeble and defenceless minority, they are necessarily harmless and but moderately influential. Their uninterruptedly embattled situation, their complete dependence on such uncertain factors as the toleration of fickle and enormously preponderant majorities *forces* them as a rule to a peculiar circumspectness of conduct and an almost nervous adherence to the ethical demands of their environment. Their situation forces them to be careful of consciously giving offence. This fact does not in the least mitigate the hatred directed against their group, but serves rather to rob that antecedent hatred of normal and excusable outlets, and all hatred is intensified when its selected object will not supply it with any decent or tolerable motivation.

This is the reason why the accusations made against the Jews, having to be substituted for real delinquencies and grievances, assume a character so wildly fantastic and improbable and bear so constantly the stamp of a feeble but melodramatic imagination, such as, for instance, the charge of a universal Jewish conspiracy looking toward Jewish world-domination. That is the reason, too, why the ethnic inferiority of the Jews, proclaimed and reiterated with wild and lunatic cunning, has come finally to be the sole foundation and rationalization of anti-Semitic ideology. It follows, curiously enough, that anti-Semitic resentment finds difficulty in attaching itself either to the actions of the Jews or even to their highly supposititious vices, which are constantly negated by the test of experience, and has been forced to attach itself to the *external* traits of the Jew—his physiognomic type, his gestures, his manner of speech, to those characteristics, in brief, which are certainly Jewish but which cannot possibly be made the bases of an ethical valuation. Ethical condemnation is here supplemented by æsthetic repudiation. The majority naturally dictates all æsthetic norms; it supplies the group ideal of beauty; thus it stamps the abnormal, the *unlike*, the nonconforming with the stamp of the unbeautiful, the repulsive, the ugly. This transferring of ethical to æsthetic devaluation is a *general* accompaniment of ethnic or group antagonisms. The physical type of the foreigner is felt to be ugly and is perceived as tolerable only in so far as it approaches the native type. The appearance of him who is hated is distorted in the perception of him afflicted with hatred into hatefulness of aspect. Thus during the World War the nations delineated their enemies in cinema pictures and cartoons with all the traits of bestial hideousness. This hideousness was, of course, subsequently accepted as the symbol of an inner and moral hideousness, since hostility on the basis of mere physical differentiation, felt as ugliness, was recognized as an insufficient motivation of hatred so murderous. By means of this insane but

normal process the Jewish nose becomes the outer and visible symbol of a supposed Jewish insolence, the Jewish eye of an imputed disloyalty, the Jewish smile of an assumed treachery. Thus it is the *outwardness* of the Jew, which is both characteristic and perceptible by the senses, that is evaluated as inferior, gives offence and everywhere and always is used to activate the existent hatred. It is not for nothing that so many Jews have sought to suppress or hide their racial physical traits and not without cause have they sought to assimilate at least the gestures and manners of the dominant majority. They have thus, of course, not in the least eliminated or enfeebled Jew hatred, but have merely sought by mimicry to escape its grosser effects. . . .

Racial enmities exist in the world in exact proportion to the number of recognizable ethnic groups. The enmity of such groups need not be sharper than among groups of other kinds. But the permanence of both peculiar physical and psychical traits renders fusion or absorption more difficult and in extreme cases forbids them altogether. Hence the ethnic group is peculiarly fitted to be a fighting unit; its characteristics are flags and insignia in themselves; the enemy is recognizable at a glance and desertion is next to impossible. . . . The difficulty of fusion or absorption tends to sharpen conflict and render its aim devoid of mercy: extermination or complete subjection are the alternatives. Subjection, even the completest, is only a substitute aim for extermination, but the latter is difficult in this period of universal news and interlocking human interests. Groups not affected by the conflict will accept it as an occasion of intervention and even the help given to the persecuted of an alien land is often used to intensify hostile attitudes which already exist.

It is these factors that determine the stubbornness of anti-Semitism, the deep irreconcilability of the antithesis which it expresses and the apparently stupid juxtaposition of trivial and tragic expressions of hatred. The complete

extirpation of Jewish groups occurs but rarely. Pogrom waves are commoner. Commoner still are mass expulsions of Jewish groups from their dwelling-places. One gives them a chance to withdraw from sudden or slow destruction by flight. Yet even where these fugitives are received with benevolence at best, with condescending tolerance at worst, their condition will be one of more or less veiled subjection and enslavement. Out of this condition of moral enslavement there has arisen that hatred of so many Jews toward their own group which presents in both its grosser and its subtler forms so lamentable a picture.

III

Last Words

Certain ultimate conclusions from the entire situation should be soberly and clearly drawn.

Since the expression of enmity between groups corresponds to a primary psychical need and since the dark instinctive passion of this need creates freely, without any reference to reality, a devaluating and contorted image of the supposedly hostile group and utilizes the ever-present frictions of life as pretexts for its reiteration or even provokes new frictions in order to prove by means of them the evil character of the antithetical group—it follows that *no* significance whatsoever attaches to the character or the actions of this latter group and that they have *no* connection with the degree of hostility or its expression. Conspicuous harmlessness or excellence only drives him who is impelled and determined to hate to find ever subtler and more fantastic pretexts for his hatred.

Hence the character of the Jews is utterly irrelevant; what they do or fail to do is equally so. Hence it is futile for them to seek to oppose anti-Semitism by any *kind* of human behaviour. If they seek to avoid the strictures of their foes by avoiding any imputed fault, their new atti-

tude will be equally attacked because it is a Jewish attitude and they will be mocked in the bargain for assuming virtues that are not theirs. Under exceptionally favourable circumstances the Jew may temporarily hide from the results of hatred; he can never please his foes and the attempt to do so will only cause him to incur the last reproach of servile weakness.

And since it is not real lacks or vices that evoke anti-Semitism, it is an error to believe that a Jew can get the better of this hatred by personal qualities or achievements. Conspicuous success may occasionally be accepted as the price of entrance into Gentile society; anti-Semitism as such is diminished by no success, no virtue, and no achievement; it is like a tropic sun that sears the unjust and just Jew alike.

Thus it is of no avail to argue against anti-Semitic reproaches or imputations and to demonstrate their groundlessness; for anti-Semitism is not based on them, but uses them only as pretexts or rationalizations. If it happens that a given accusation is so clearly shown to be false that it cannot serve the anti-Semite's purpose—a rare occurrence on account of the irrelevant and fictive character of all such accusations—he will simply be forced to find new grounds for his hatred, and he *will* find them. We shall nevertheless continue to deny accusations, unmask slanders, and expose forgeries, but we should not do it without a conviction of the ultimate futility of all such measures.

Nor shall we fail to be indignant nor to cry out in our despair if tomorrow, even as today, Jews are murdered, tortured, robbed of their rights. We shall, as ever, appeal to the conscience of the peoples and demand of them an accounting for their evil deeds even as we desire to be *called* to accounting and to bear the weight of any responsibility that is our own. But we must not, therefore, suppose that our outcries or monitions will change human nature one jot or that our indignation or our anguish will alter the fact that the human psyche transmutes pain and

frustration into enmity. A phenomenon like inter-group hatred, in brief, cannot be eliminated by moral appeals and any pacification that is anywhere achieved takes human nature as it is and not as we would have it be. . . .

This argument does not imply that the peculiar form of group enmity called anti-Semitism can *never* be destroyed. For it is with all its fatal consequences both for us and for our foes the consequence of an unhappy combination of circumstances that mark a given historic period. We cannot suddenly change human nature. We can hope, with reason or without, that in another three thousand years the world will be more in harmony with *our* yearning for peace among men and *our* dreams of moral perfection than it has been during the last three thousand years of Jewish history. But it is senseless to expect any sign of such amelioration within the first few centuries.

A regrouping of human masses offers a more realistic hope. Such regroupings can take place within reasonable periods. It is only because Jews live everywhere as scattered, weak, defenceless ethnic minorities that the normal group-hatred of mankind when directed against them assumes forms so cruel and so blasting. If one can end this specific situation, then, too, anti-Semitism which has made the life of the Jewish people for so long a veritable martyrdom, can be finally liquidated.

A Jewish people that lives in closed settlements in its own land will doubtless be exposed to the normal enmities of its neighbouring peoples and war will alternate with peace, as has been the way of the world for so long. But this enmity between the Jewish people and its neighbouring peoples will at least be a *normal* enmity and not that thrice-cursed one-sided hatred which has followed the fragments of a people for so long upon all the roads of earth.

This argument does not imply the certainty of success of the Zionist aspiration and attempt. The movement could well be shattered against obstacles of several kinds.

Today the prospects of the plan seem reasonably favourable; time alone can teach us whether these hopes will come to full fruition. But that there is no other *possibility* of putting an end to anti-Semitism should appear as utterly irrefutable from the foregoing arguments.

THEODOR LESSING

The well-known philosopher and university teacher, Theodor Lessing, was born in Hanover in 1872 and was assassinated from ambush by Nazi gangsters in Czechoslovakia in 1933. He took the ultimate step of assimilation, submission to baptism, in his youth, but returned to Judaism in 1900 and, joined by his wife, a Christian lady, descended from the Prussian nobility, identified himself completely with his people and the Zionist movement. He was for many years professor at the Hanover Institute of Technology (*Technische Hochschule*) and published works on Schopenhauer, Wagner, and Nietzsche, on the philosophy of values, on the decline of the West (1915), thus anticipating Spengler, and on history as the meaningful interpretation of the meaningless. In 1925, just before the election of Hindenburg to the Presidency of the Reich, he wrote an article in criticism of the Field-Marshal which led to an outburst of anti-Semitic passion in German academic circles which forced Lessing, in spite of the backing of the government of the republic, to suspend his lectures in 1926.

His last work, published in 1930, *Der jüdische Selbsthass* (*Jewish Self-hatred*), is a sensitive blending of philosophy and art. After an introduction (from which the following pages are taken) Lessing writes biographical studies of six crypto-Jews, including Otto Weininger (the author of *Genius and Character*) and Maximilian Harden. These are the most revelatory documents in existence concerning the inevitable perversion and spiritual decay caused by the process of assimilation *per se* even when the assimilant is all that is sincere and high-minded.

THEODOR LESSING

The Western Jew

I

ON THIS day on which I begin to write this book concerning the self-hatred of the Jews, those who live in the West are celebrating a memorial day: the two-hundredth birthday of a man who freed them from the fetters of the *Galuth* and was the first to show them the way to Western culture, speech, and manners. Moses Mendelssohn, the crooked son of a Thora scribe in Dessau was the miracle man who turned the scattered remnants of "dreamers of the Ghetto" into the honourable congregations of "German citizens of the Mosaic faith."

We are forced to regard what he accomplished with other eyes today than did the men of the enlightenment (*Haskala*).

Around 1800 the Jews and the Parsees, last remnants of two immemorial scattered communities, formed a kind of connecting link between the all-conquering will of Europe and America and, on the other hand, the slowly disappearing mythic worlds of antique Africa and Asia.

In the midst of the Christian state with its will to uniform civilization the Ghetto was a bit of romantic antiquity. Our opposition to the will toward cultural uniformity became untenable. It was quite as vain as the resistance of Indians or Negroes against the West. The sun of Western civilization simply melted the ancient peoples. The opposition which the Jews had practised was

quite analogous to that of the old Saxons against Christianization at the hands of Karl the Great. Hence even later than Luther the Jews were always bracketed with the heathen. "You are a Jew," that meant, originally: "You are no Christian creature, but barbarous and heathen." Thus the development of "modern culture" is inseparable from Christianity. Moses Mendelssohn made a more or less clean sweep of the historic Jewish past in order (as Heinrich Heine was later to phrase it) to obtain for the Jews a valid ticket for entering European civilization.

Neither Mendelssohn nor his greater friend, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, is to be blamed for harbouring the naïve hope that the differences between cults and religions would soon become merely picturesque phases of a universal religion of Reason.

It is in this sense that the rabbis in the seminaries of the West have sought to interpret and develop Judaism. They no longer desired a national Jewish religion; they desired Judaism to be the symbol of the new universal religion. . . .

In 1800 the entrance of the Jews into the common life of men seemed a gain to everyone. Religious prejudice existed. Anti-Semitism on racial grounds had not yet been invented. . . . Hence the Jews of that period are not to be blamed for assimilation even in its extreme forms. They really believed in the dominance of brotherhood or, at the least, of genuine toleration. They heard the great happy words: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." And it seemed for a time as though the promises of the French Revolution were to be kept. The Ghettoes were opened; special legislation for Jews was abrogated. The thousand galling and humiliating restrictions disappeared between 1800 and 1850. Talmudic law became a subject of scholarly preoccupation. The Jews as equal citizens were subjected to the common laws. Their religion became a "faith" among others.

Thus even the grandchildren of Mendelssohn had ceased

to be Jews. This process would have been far more widespread had not a new force arisen to check disintegration and assimilation: the class struggle.

II

The industrial revolution brought with it the war of the classes. As the machine, modern technique, banking, and industry subjected the whole earth to themselves, it seemed to become the most vital of all struggles. What mattered now the old religious conflicts? The very differences among peoples seemed no longer so decisive as the differences among economic strata.

Karl Marx, theorist of the class war, saw in his fellow Jews only "the uprooted hangers-on of capitalism and its system." The so-called emancipation of the Jews seemed to him merely their absorption into the bourgeoisie and this in turn their "being delivered into the hands of that capitalistic society which in a distant future will be replaced by a socialist society." Marx did not acknowledge a Jewish people within the conflict of nationalities. And, indeed, in his day such a people was to be found only in the east of Europe, where the Jews are predominantly workers; for those historians who represent the Jews as a people of usurers do not even know that the taking of interest and the practice of usury are forbidden by the Mosaic Law and simply did not exist among Jews until, from the thirteenth century on, the feudal age forced upon the Jews the business of banking and money.

Thus in the West Karl Marx observed nothing but the conflict of parties and special interests. A communist like Moses Hess, who was at the same time a Jewish nationalist and Zionist, was utterly isolated among his fellow proletarians.

With infinite delight the world of bourgeois success utilized this new explanation of the Jews and the Jewish problem. It fairly batted on the fact that the enemies of

capitalism connected the Jews with the capitalistic bourgeoisie. For a sinful world needs a scapegoat. And so all the horrors of imperialist colonization, exploitation, and enslavement, even those that were practised against the Jews themselves, were "explained" as being due to the history and character of the Jewish participants of the capitalistic order. . . .

III

Bitter as it is, it must be acknowledged that this reaction against the Jews helped save the Jewish people. Assimilation was making enormous inroads till that new wave of hate rolled up.

The "progressive Jew" who had his place at all the tables of Europe was suddenly faced by a wall of hatred. This hatred brought him to his senses. Zionism arose; the seed of national rebirth germinated. For though among the earlier leaders, Pinskov, Nordau, even the noble Herzl, Zionism began defensively—rooted in resistance, pride or pity—it was not long until positively creative elements asserted themselves. The very next generation was Zionist because it was instinctively Jewish, not because its Jewish pride had been hurt.

And yet? And now?

Power is slothful; capital is cowardly; the satiated are lukewarm.

Where, till the other day, the European burgher of the Mosaic faith manned the cohorts of progress and the forward look (harmless and handsome points of view) there gathered all the respectables of Jewish society. There you found the great names and the honorific titles; there you met the leading personalities of art and science and industry.

We, the outcasts, who hold it to be far more heroic to be a homeless nomad than a well-established citizen, may not we on the two-hundredth birthday of the man who

caused Hebrew speech and writing, cult and dress, festival and myth, to fall into gradual decay—may not we briefly indulge in a phantasy? (Our fancy, by the way, doesn't so violently outrage probability when you remember that "Non-coöperation Movement" which a certain Mahatma Gandhi undertook within another people that held itself to be menaced by Christian civilization.)

Suppose for a moment that the Jews, too, had refused to coöperate; that, during the period when the badge of shame and the special laws were abrogated and civic rights and so-called equality were offered them they had said as follows: "During two thousand years we have lived in expectation of the Messiah who, as it was foretold, was to lead us to our homeland. Now in your generosity and friendship you offer us as fatherlands both Europe and America. But you demand in return that we give up our historical tradition in order to merge our consciousness with the history and traditions of the great Western nations. That we cannot do. We have never dreamed of asking you to assimilate to us. We have never sent out missionaries nor ever desired conquest. So we will quietly continue to wear our earlocks and to endure the badge of shame. We will preserve our Hebrew speech and names. We want no part in your feasts and commemoration, each one of which brings to us memories of martyrdoms. Gladly do we leave to you your images and your gods! But leave us that which is ours. We are different from each other and that difference endures. It is not we but you who proclaimed to the world that God had become a man. We have never followed the Gospel of the Incarnation. For our God lives beyond the realm of form and name and also beyond man and all the horrors of man's history. Despise us, if you must. We decline your favour and cannot pay the price. Not for us are your dignities and schools, titles and means. We would not share your sciences and arts. Voluntarily we shall continue in Galuth and Ghetto and wait for the Messiah."

Would it have been possible to have answered thus?

It would have been possible in that day when a saying of the Rambam, a stanza of Halevi, a letter of Rashi was still the world in which there lived a Jewish people guided in its exile by its sages.

On all sides one hears loud praise of all the Jew has gained by his participation in Western civilization and of what that civilization has gained through him. But no one sees or barely whispers concerning the price at which the Jews became Europeans: Disloyalty to the visions of their hope; the sacrifice of their timeless dreams. Today the people is not led by consecrated sages, but organized by lawyers and bankers.

Modern free-thinking, progressive, highly cultivated Jews are mightily proud of the fact that in recent decades Jews have been ministers of state and generals, explorers, university teachers, theatrical directors, famous writers, and what not! It were better we were ashamed of these counterfeits of our spiritual wealth. Were these people not perhaps only the phosphorescence of the decay of our folk-body? They were perhaps only perishable flames of a European day, equally perishable, in which our essential nobility burned itself up.

Today, at all events, let us cry shame upon those sons of ours who would rather "go in for literature" or "choose an academic calling" to serve the luxurious cities of the West, than to carry stones upon the road that leads to Yerushalayim.

MAX BROD

The well-known novelist and dramatist, Max Brod, several of whose books, notably *Rëubeni, Prince of the Jews*, have been translated into English, was born in Prague in 1884. He studied law and was until 1924 a civil servant of the Czechoslovak republic. Influenced by Martin Buber and his group, he realigned himself with his people and began to study Hebrew.

Thirty years had passed above my head
Ere the language of my folk I learned.
Then at last I was redeemed from deafness.

It is needless to give a list of his many novels and plays and essays in which the developing influence of the Jewish conception of the collaboration of man with God toward the sanctification of life and the universe itself and of the recurrent demand of ethical decision can be progressively studied. In 1922, moreover, Brod published a central ideological work on the whole matter: *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum (Paganism, Christianity and Judaism)* in two volumes. This very valuable though unsystematic work (from which the following extracts are taken) is occasionally too deeply influenced by Brod's intellectual environment, as when he exerts himself so passionately to prove that the notion of "grace" is present in Jewish religious thinking and feeling, for no better reason, apparently, than that anti-Semitic German theologians had denied the fact. The book, however, is infinitely rich, various, and suggestive as a whole.

Brod's latest work, a novel with the unhappily trivial and hence misleading title, *Die Frau die nicht Enttäuscht (The Woman Who Does Not Disappoint)*, published in Amster-

dam in 1933, contains many pages of extraordinary beauty and subtlety on the entire Jewish problem and specifically on the fate of a Jewish writer who has given all of himself to a definite European civilization and who is now repudiated by that civilization.

MAX BROD

I

Jewish Naïveté

WHEREVER there is freedom there is naïveté. And so it would seem natural enough that the Jewish soul with its great realm of freedom, a freedom defended even against God, should be the happy playground for a healthy naïveté or ingenuousness of the heart. Nevertheless, as is generally known, the Jew is commonly held to be utterly lacking in instinctive simplicity and to typify the abstract brain, conscious artifice—all that is the antithesis of immediacy and freshness of power.

How often is the Jewish artist made to hear this reproach in its various forms. That fact is in itself unimportant. What is tragic is that we Jews have lost the organ for perceiving our own qualities; we no longer understand our own souls. More and more we regard ourselves with the dull eyes of strangers and we give credence to others' characterization of ourselves. We believe the things concerning ourselves that others have invented. Between ourselves and our vital being we place the misunderstandings of the mob. Out of sheer submissiveness to alien valuations and morbid conscientiousness we misvalue and undervalue ourselves. We accept a rubber stamp made by strangers to our being. And if sometimes (a thing even more painful) we overestimate ourselves, we do even that by the measurement of norms not applicable to ourselves. Thus our "election" and our "religion" are conceived of

by us as though they were identical with the same notions as held among other peoples. And because our naïveté is of a consistency differing from that of the same quality in a Frenchman or German, it is supposed that we have not any. . . . An assembly of blond people (let us say) has been pleased to resolve that a dark-haired man has no hair at all. Obediently the dark man accepts the implied judgment. In the end he too gets to the point of imagining that black hair isn't really hair at all. . . .

In this matter, as in all others, the cry must be: let us return to our sacred sources. What exquisite naïveté is there not revealed where the world would least expect it—in the folios of the Talmud. . . . How heartfelt and deep and nobly simple is the Talmudic spirit that treats of the relation between man and God. Our tradition records a trustfulness and simple veracity in man's dealing with the source of light and an ingenuousness of attitude which moves the hardened and corrupted contemporary to tears. Moses is speaking to God on Sinai and the tractate *Sabbath* tells us that he finds God busy making little crowns for the letters of the Torah. "Is it not customary among you to give a greeting?" God asks Moses, and Moses answers: "Assuredly, yet may a bondman not greet a master first!" Thereupon God: "Then thou shouldst have wished me a good wish—that my work may succeed." So Moses blesses God. "May the power of the Eternal be great, according to His word." . . . I take this occasion to recommend the reading of the haggadic portions of the Talmud to all those ignoramuses (including Renan and any who give the word Pharisaism its wrong and popular meaning) who stubbornly insist that Jewish religious feeling and attitude are thin, harshly reflective, unpoetic, and unmythic. A really excellent collection of this material would do wonders and finally silence the babble concerning Jewish over-rationalism. Let me give out of our world of mythic lore a single one of the innumerable stories that treat the theme of the oneness, of the equality in substance

of the human and divine and that bear witness to the grandeur and dignity and strange naïveté of the life-style of the Talmudic period. The tale is recorded in the Tractate Baba Mezia, or the Middle Gate, and may be translated somewhat as follows: One day Rabbi Elieser contended against all the other members of the Council. Since none of his arguments prevailed he said: "If my decision is correct let yonder tree be my witness!" Thereupon the tree seemed to uproot itself and to be hurled a hundred miles; some say even four hundred miles. Coolly the sages replied: "A tree is no admissible witness." Rabbi Elieser said: "If I am right, yonder stream will bear me witness." Instantly the stream reversed its course. Once more the sages spake: "Neither is water admissible." And Rabbi Elieser cried: "Let the walls of this house of study bow down to prove my rightness." Instantly the four walls began to incline themselves. But Rabbi Jehoshua, the president of the Council cried out upon them: "Walls, when sages contend concerning 'the way,' what right have you to interfere?" So out of reverence for Rabbi Jehoshua the walls inclined themselves no farther, neither, out of reverence for Rabbi Elieser, did they straighten themselves up again. And they remained leaning forward as can be seen to this day.—Rabbi Elieser did not yield and cried at last: "If I am right, may God bear me witness!" Whereupon a heavenly voice was heard saying: "Why contend ye against Rabbi Elieser ben Hyrkanos, since in all points 'the way' is as he deems." Rabbi Jehoshua, however, arose from his seat: "The Torah," said he, "is no more in heaven. It was given unto us from Sinai, whereupon the heavenly voices were silenced. And the Torah commands that the majority is to decide." With that the meeting was dissolved. But some time later Rabbi Nathan, who had been present at that memorable session, met the Prophet Elijah and asked him: "What did the heavenly council say to that meeting?" Elijah answered: "God smiled and spake

the words: 'My children have gotten the better of me.' " . . .

The religious literature of the world has probably no passage so instinct with an exquisite trust or wherein man leans so serenely upon his God. Yet we let the Christians tell us—and often assent—that Christianity originated the notion of God's tender fatherhood. Yet the earliest generation of our sages as trustful children of God created this and other legends of the utmost simplicity and spontaneity of heart, pondering even upon the day's work of their Heavenly Father as it is described in the Tractate of Abodah Zara or Concerning Idolatry "The day consists of twelve hours. During the first three hours God studies the Torah; during the second three hours He judges the world. But since He sees that all men have deserved to be condemned He rises from the seat of justice and seats Himself upon the seat of mercy. In the third three hours He prepares for all living things their needed sustenance. In the last three hours He plays with Leviathan. For it is written: There is Leviathan whom Thou hast formed to play with him" (Psalm 104:26).

Here is the note of free creative and artistic joy that we are supposed to lack. At the end of His day's work God plays with the gorgeous monster whom He created out of the joyous fulness of His might. . . .

II

The Great Transition in a Jewish Life

This sketch of the life of Rabbi Elijah Gutmacher is based upon materials contributed by S. L. Zitron to Martin Buber's monthly magazine *Der Jude* (May, 1918):

Elijah Gutmacher (1796-1874) studied at the Yeshiva (Talmudical Seminary) of the famous Rabbi Akiba Eger of Posen and soon became the latter's favourite student. In his earliest youth he represented a pronouncedly ascetic

type. He lived isolated and alone. From his childhood on he wandered about in Silesia from Yeshiva to Yeshiva, learning Torah, serving God, practising *Aboda*. Wandering about thus he studied mankind, observed life, and sought to gain a right insight. His experiences affected young Gutmacher in two ways: on the one hand his heart was stirred by human suffering and made defenceless against human sorrow; on the other hand he was repelled by humanity, seeing that man was man's own enemy and oppressor. And so it came to pass that he did not seek to gain friends, that he avoided the company of his fellows, fell in love with solitariness, and held converse only with his own soul.

Profoundly influenced by reading the *Zohar* (the mystical *Book of Light*), he developed a highly individual interpretation of Judaism which may be stated somewhat as follows. According to the original plan of creation man was to be the image of the Eternal. The serpent caused him to sin and fall. By the revelation from Sinai order was once more introduced into chaos and there arose the triune substance: Jew-Torah-(Law)-Shechinah (the glory or grace or true "abiding" of the Divine). . . . These three elements of Gutmacher may well be interpreted as (1) the "I" (the human subject), (2) the commands imposed from without by duty (categorical imperative, moral insight), and (3) the love of God with its instinctive, utterly integrated, and happy impulse toward good. All three elements are needful. It does not suffice to obey the commands of the Torah—that is, to practice righteousness. The *Shechinah* must be present if the right deed is to be inspired by the right fervour and to result in the right satisfaction. And so it was, according to Gutmacher, in Palestine of old. Under the sky of the promised land Israel and the *Shechinah* had become one. Thence arose the spirit to which mankind owes the prophets, those first creators and upholders of a truly human and universal ethos. When, however, the Jews were driven from Palestine

on account of the sin of not having kept pure the flame of this three-fold life, the Torah went into exile with them, following their earthly wanderings. But the *Shechinah* fled and separated itself from the other two elements. . . . The Torah was severed from the *Shechinah*. Which means in human terms: the "thou shalt" has remained; the answering "I will with joy" is irrecoverable by any effort. How profoundly this feeling was integrated with the texture of Gutmacher's life; how it was the conclusion drawn from concrete suffering and overwhelming veracity may be seen by returning to concrete details of his biography.

He received rabbinical consecration at an early age. Rabbi Akiba Eger directed him to marry and to accept the rabbinate in the town of Pleschen. Once established, there began in Gutmacher that process of purification of which he had dreamed and had made the aim of his life. He sought to cleanse himself of all the passions and to partake of the things of this world only so much as was necessary for the bare sustenance of his body. When any need or misfortune, whether of an individual or a community, was brought to his attention he was the first to bring help and to exceed his strength. He distributed his entire salary among the needy. He spent his days and nights with poor sick people and with poor women in labour and brought them refreshment and consolation. He made himself the special guardian of poor widows and orphans; he sought out all afflicted with bitterness of heart and took their bitterness upon himself. . . . Nor did he inquire into the race or faith of men. "Trouble," he was wont to say, "is universal and so must help be." Yet it seemed to him that all he did was far far too little; that he had perhaps not put forth all his strength or sacrificed beyond his uttermost. Thus he was always dissatisfied with himself, and every night before going to bed he would note this dissatisfaction in a diary found after his death. In this diary he would note his activities of each day, and almost always ended with some self-criticism and self-punishment. Com-

ing home late from a day spent in teaching and in errands of mercy he murmured: "I haven't in the least fulfilled my duty before my soul this day."

Yet while Gutmacher was so discontented with himself he was called in Pleschen and all that country not otherwise than the "holy man." He had, moreover, founded a Yeshiva where 400 students came from near and far and these he sought to train in his spirit. He dreamed that these 400 would be a nucleus from which might radiate a company of purified souls through whom the work of true redemption might begin. He directed his Yeshiva during thirty-four years and taught many hundreds of youths, but the realization of his dream came no nearer. That depressed Gutmacher profoundly. He said in speech and recorded it in his diary that it was his fault and none other's. He had evidently not perfected himself sufficiently to be a truly persuasive example to others.

By and by Gutmacher departed from Pleschen and became rabbi in Graetz on the Russo-Polish frontier. Here he redoubled his striving after purification. He passed many hours in the open, serving God under His sky and praying under the trees of the forest. He was over sixty years old at this time. Tall and slender, with great black eyes and a long white beard, his aspect was nobly patriarchal. All these circumstances led to an almost legendary fame which influenced especially the Jewish masses on the other side of the frontier. And it was not long until from small Polish towns and villages sick men and barren women and all manner of afflicted people came to Gutmacher to beg for his prayers and his advice. Gutmacher was deeply grieved and troubled by this circumstance. He had no desire to be considered a wonder-working rabbi. Yet he found it difficult to send away the many, many unhappy people who came to him without some consolation or help. Thus he had to neglect study and prayer and meditation and finally wrote an open letter in the Hebrew periodical *Ha Magid* (*The Preacher*) in which he besought the

people to give up their pilgrimages, seeing that he was a simple mortal who could bring help not even to his own soul. "And even if, as you believe," he wrote, "my prayers are pleasing to God, then be assured that I pray not for myself alone but for the whole house of Israel." But this appeal did not stem the flood. For simple souls thought that a great saint must necessarily be as modest as that.

Thus Gutmacher's striving after perfection ended in his old age in a conflict which he could not resolve. But he was not fated to die without the grace of a resolution. . . . This grace and this resolution of conflict came to Gutmacher in the form of pre-Herzlian Zionism, which at last gave him the hope and the faith that it would be possible once more to accomplish a great spiritual rebirth. The call came about in this manner. One day Gutmacher received from his very old friend, the well-known Rabbi Zwi Hirsch Kalischer, a written invitation to visit Thorn on a matter of the utmost importance touching the people. Thus he participated in Thorn at that first convention of Jewish notables and rabbis in 1860 which discussed the resettling of Palestine and thus founded that movement known as *Chibat-Zion* (Love of Zion) which soon spread among all the orthodox of Germany and thence to other lands.

And now suddenly Gutmacher found the answer to the problem of Jewish redemption with which he had struggled for so many years. . . . The Palestine ideal became the content of the rest of his life. He was one of the first leaders of the Zionist movement and defended it against opponents of all kinds. He was profoundly happy when the first Palestine Society was founded at Frankfurt on the Oder in 1861 and welcomed the founders with tears of joy. And when Moses Hess published *Rome and Jerusalem* Rabbi Elijah Gutmacher was among the first to hail the book as a great achievement. The Talmudist and Cabbalist found in the socialist and philosopher his brother and comrade. The great synthesis had been made.

When he was near his eightieth year Gutmacher re-

corded in his diary the balance, so to speak, of his long life and spiritual efforts, and ended that record with these words: "I shall die comforted. The *Shechinah* yearns once more for its ancient beloved and I am persuaded that the threefold substance of Israel's true life will be integrated once again."

ALBERT EINSTEIN

It is needless to expatiate here upon the career or achievements of the man who is by universal consent the greatest of living scientists and one of the greatest of all time. What is significant both for Jews, who are not sufficiently impressed by his example, and for those Christians who, especially in the ranks of liberals and apparent philo-Semites are still urging the Jewish people upon the barren road of assimilation is this: that this lofty intellect, joined in his case to the moral insight of saintliness and the human imagination of the artist, embraced the cause of his people as embodied in the Jewish renaissance and the Zionist movement very many years ago, impelled thereto at the time by no outer urgency or public disfavour but as a free act of intellectual and moral decision. Professor Einstein belongs to the governing body of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; he has travelled and lectured as propagandist for the *Keren Hayessod* (Palestine Foundation Fund), and is undeviatingly active in Zionism. The following pages are reprinted, by Professor Einstein's personal permission, from *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, 1931.

ALBERT EINSTEIN

Assimilation and Nationalism

I

BEFORE we can effectively combat anti-Semitism, we must first of all educate ourselves out of it and out of the slave-mentality which it betokens. We must have more dignity, more independence, in our own ranks. Only when we have the courage to regard ourselves as a nation, only when we respect ourselves, can we win the respect of others; or rather, the respect of others will then come of itself. Anti-Semitism as a psychological phenomenon will always be with us so long as Jews and non-Jews are thrown together. But where is the harm? It may be thanks to anti-Semitism that we are able to preserve our existence as a race; that at any rate is my belief.

When I come across the phrase "German Citizens of the Jewish persuasion," I cannot avoid a melancholy smile. What does this highfalutin' description really mean? What is this "Jewish persuasion"? Is there, then, a kind of non-persuasion by virtue of which one ceases to be a Jew? There is not. What the description really means is that our *beaux esprits* are proclaiming two things:

First, I wish to have nothing to do with my poor (East European) Jewish brethren;

Secondly, I wish to be regarded not as a son of my people, but only as a member of a religious community.

Is this honest? Can an Aryan respect such dissemblers? I am not a German citizen, nor is there anything about me that can be described as "Jewish persuasion." But I am a Jew, and I am glad to belong to the Jewish people, though I do not regard it as "chosen." Let us just leave anti-Semitism to the non-Jews, and keep our own hearts warm for our kith and kin.

1920

II

Until about a generation ago the Jews in Germany did not regard themselves as belonging to the Jewish people. They felt themselves only members of a religious community, and many of them still hold this point of view. They are, in fact, much more assimilated than the Russian Jews. They have been to mixed schools, and have thus adapted themselves to German national and cultural life. Nevertheless, and in spite of the equal political rights which they have secured, there exists in Germany a strong movement of social anti-Semitism. And it is just the educated circles who have set themselves up as carriers of this anti-Semitic disease. They have built up for themselves a "culture" of anti-Semitism, while the educated Russians, at least before the war, were on the whole philo-Semitic, and made frequent and honest endeavours to fight the anti-Semitic movement.

This phenomenon in Germany is due to several causes. Partly it originates in the fact that Jews there exercise an influence over the intellectual life of the German people altogether out of proportion to their numbers. While, in my opinion, the economic position of the German Jews is very much over-rated, the influence of Jews on the press, in literature, and in science in Germany is very marked, as must be apparent to even the most superficial observer. This accounts for the fact that there are many anti-Semites there whose anti-Semitism is not just hatred of the Jew,

but is based on arguments in which they honestly believe. They regard Jews as of a nationality different from the German, and therefore are alarmed at the increasing Jewish influence on their national life. Although perhaps the percentage of Jews in England is not much less than in Germany, English Jews certainly do not exercise the influence on English society that German Jews do in Germany. This notwithstanding that the highest professional positions are accessible to them, and a Jew can become Lord Chief Justice or Viceroy of India, whereas in Germany the attainment of such positions by a Jew is unthinkable.

In many instances anti-Semitism may be determined by political considerations. It often depends, in other words, on the political party to which a man belongs whether he becomes a professed anti-Semite. A Socialist, for instance, even if he is an anti-Semite by conviction, will not proclaim his creed or act up to it, because it is not in the program of his party. Among Conservatives, however, it is different. Anti-Semitism in their case arises from a desire to exacerbate for their party purposes the ill-feeling inherent in the populace. In a country like England, this influence is smaller than in many others, while the existence of old and deep-rooted liberal traditions hinders the rapid growth of anti-Semitism. I say this without any personal knowledge of the country. I have never until now been in England. That, I would add in parenthesis, perhaps accounts for the enthusiasm with which my theories were received here. But in Germany the judgment of my theories depended on the party politics of the press, while English science did not allow its sense of objectivity to be disturbed by political views. The English people have had a great influence on the development of science, and so have tackled the examination of the theory of relativity with particular energy and particular success. Whilst in America, again, anti-Semitism knows only social forms, in Germany communal anti-Semitism is much stronger even

than social. As I view the matter, the fact of the racial peculiarities of Jews is bound to have an influence on their social intercourse. I believe that German Judaism is thus being influenced to a great extent by anti-Semitism. With increasing wealth and increasing education the religious customs which formerly prevented the mixing of Jews with Gentiles have tended to disappear. There was thus nothing but the antithesis which Jews represent, and which is called anti-Semitism, to preserve Jewish separateness. Without this antithesis assimilation in Germany would have been complete long ago.

I have noticed this sort of thing in myself. Until two years ago I lived in Switzerland, and during my stay there I did not realize my Judaism. There was nothing that called forth any Jewish sentiments in me. When I moved to Berlin all that changed. There I realized the difficulties with which many young Jews were confronted. I saw how, amid anti-Semitic surroundings, systematic study, and with it the road to a safe existence, was made impossible for them. This refers specially to the Eastern-born Jews in Germany, who were continually exposed to provocation. I do not believe that their number is large in Germany as a whole. Only in Berlin are they at all numerous. Nevertheless, their presence has become a public question. At meetings and conferences and in the press there is a movement for disposing of them quickly or interning them. Housing difficulties and the economic depression are used as arguments for these harsh measures. Facts are deliberately exaggerated in order to influence public opinion. These Eastern-born Jews are made the scapegoat of all the ills of present-day German political life and all the after-effects of the war. Incitement against these unfortunate fugitives, who have only just saved themselves from the hell which Eastern Europe means for them today, has become an effective political weapon, employed with success by every demagogue. When the government contemplated the expulsion of these Jews, I stood up for them,

and pointed out in the *Berliner Tageblatt* the inhumanity and the folly of such a measure. Together with some colleagues, Jews and non-Jews, I started university courses for these Eastern-born Jews, and I must add that in this matter we enjoyed official recognition and considerable assistance from the Ministry of Education.

These and similar happenings have awakened in me the Jewish national sentiment. I am a national Jew in the sense that I demand the preservation of the Jewish nationality as of every other. I look upon Jewish nationality as a fact, and I think that every Jew ought to come to definite conclusions on Jewish questions on the basis of this fact. I regard the growth of Jewish self-assertion as being in the interests of non-Jews as well as of Jews. That was the main motive of my joining the Zionist movement. For me Zionism is not merely a question of colonization. The Jewish nation is a living thing, and the sentiment of Jewish nationalism must be developed both in Palestine and everywhere else. To deny the Jew's nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnic nationalism to Palestine, then to all intents and purposes one denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through assimilation as quickly and as completely as possible.

We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his co-religionists. The meaning of Zionism is thus many-sided. To Jews who despair in the Ukrainian hell or in Poland it opens out hopes of a more human existence. Through the return of Jews to Palestine, and so to a normal and healthy economic life, Zionism involves a creative function, which should enrich mankind at large. But the main point is that Zionism must tend to enhance the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been

annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.

Through the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, the Jewish people will again be in a position to bring its creative abilities into full play without hindrance. Through the Jewish University and similar institutions the Jewish people will not only help forward its own national renaissance, but will enrich its moral culture and knowledge, and will once again, as it was centuries ago, be guided into better ways of life than those which are inevitably imposed on it in present conditions.

1921

III

The rebuilding of Palestine is for us Jews not a mere matter of charity or emigration: it is a problem of paramount importance for the Jewish people. Palestine is first and foremost not a refuge for East European Jews, but the incarnation of a reawakening sense of national solidarity. But is it opportune to revive and to strengthen this sense of solidarity? To that question I must reply with an unqualified affirmative, not only because that answer expresses my instinctive feeling, but also, I believe, on rational grounds. Let us glance at the history of the Jews in Germany during the last century or so. A hundred years ago our ancestors, with very few exceptions, still lived in the Ghetto. They were poor, and were separated from the Gentiles by a barrier of religious traditions, secular forms of life and legal restrictions. In their spiritual development they were confined to their own literature, and were influenced but faintly by the immense impetus which the Renaissance had given to the intellectual life of Europe. But in one respect these men, humbly placed and scantily regarded as they were, had a distinct advantage over us. Each one of them was bound by every fibre of his being to a community which embraced his whole existence, of

which he felt himself a full member, and which made on him no demand that ran counter to his natural mode of thought. Our ancestors of those days were rather cramped both materially and spiritually, but as a social organism they were in an enviable state of psychological equilibrium. Then came emancipation. It opened undreamt-of vistas of progress. Individual Jews rapidly became at home in the higher strata of economic and social life. They eagerly absorbed the brilliant achievements of Western art and science. They threw themselves with ardour into these developments, and themselves made contributions of permanent value. In the process they adopted the ways of life of the non-Jewish world, became increasingly estranged from their own religious and social tradition, acquired non-Jewish habits, customs, and modes of thought. It seemed as though they were going to be completely dissolved in the surrounding peoples, so much more numerous than themselves, so superior in their political and cultural organization, and that in a few generations no visible trace of them would remain. The complete disappearance of the Jews in central and western Europe seemed inevitable. But things turned out differently. Nations with racial differences appear to have instincts which work against their fusion. The assimilation of the Jews to the European nations among whom they lived, in language, in customs, and to some extent even in the forms of religious organization, could not eradicate the feeling of a lack of kinship between them and those among whom they lived. In the last resort, this instinctive feeling of lack of kinship is referable to the law of the conservation of energy. For this reason it cannot be eradicated by any amount of well-meant pressure. Nationalities do not want to be fused: they want to go each its own way. A state of peace can be brought about only if they mutually tolerate and respect one another. This demands above all things that we Jews become once more conscious of our nationality, and regain the self-respect which is necessary to our national existence. We

must learn once more to avow our ancestry and our history; we must once more take upon ourselves, as a nation, cultural tasks of a kind calculated to strengthen our feeling of solidarity. It is not sufficient for us to take part as individuals in the cultural work of mankind: we must also set our hands to some work which can serve the ends of our corporate national existence. In this way and in this way only can the Jewish people regain its health.

It is from this point of view that I look upon the Zionist movement. History has today allotted us the task of contributing actively to the economic and cultural reconstruction of Palestine. Inspired men of genius and vision have laid the foundations of our work, to which many of the best among us are prepared to devote their whole lives. It were well if all of us felt the full significance of the work and contributed each his utmost to its success.

It was in America that I first discovered the Jewish people. I have seen any number of Jews, but the Jewish people I had never met either in Berlin or elsewhere in Germany. This Jewish people, which I found in America, came from Russia, Poland, and Eastern Europe generally. These men and women still retain a healthy national feeling; it has not yet been destroyed by the process of atomization and dispersion. I found these people extraordinarily ready for self-sacrifice and practically creative. They have, for instance, managed in a short time to secure the future of the projected University in Jerusalem, at any rate so far as the medical faculty is concerned. I also found that it was mostly the middle classes and the ordinary folk, and not those enjoying a high social position or any natural advantages, who had most conspicuously preserved the healthy feeling of belonging together and the willingness to make sacrifices. The impression that I gained there is that if we really succeed in establishing a nucleus of the Jewish people in Palestine, we shall once more have a spiritual centre, notwithstanding that the great majority of us are scattered over the world, and the feeling of isola-

tion will disappear. That is the great redeeming effect which I anticipate from the rebuilding of Palestine.

1921

IV

I am convinced that our colonizing work in Palestine will be successful in the sense that we shall create there a completely coherent community, well fitted to form a moral and spiritual centre for the Jewish people. Therein, and not on the economic side, I see the real significance for us all of the work of reconstruction. In my opinion it is not so important for Palestine to become economically independent at the earliest possible moment as for it to possess a high spiritual and moral value for the whole Jewish people. From this point of view much has already been achieved by the revival of Hebrew. Institutions for the pursuit of the arts and sciences must follow. In this connexion I attach the greatest importance to the Hebrew University. Palestine will not solve the Jewish problem, but its development will mean a revival of the soul of the Jewish people.

1923

V

Generally speaking, it does not accord with my ideal that communities bound together by the bond of race or tradition should make special efforts to cultivate and emphasize their separateness. In so far, however, as a given community is attacked as such, it is bound to defend itself as such, in order that its individual members may be able to maintain their material and spiritual interests. Corporate action is needed to save the individual from those spiritual dangers which isolation necessarily entails. Whoever understands this clearly must approve of united action by all Jews for a corporate purpose, be he never so unsympathetic in principle to nationalism.

It is for me beyond any shadow of doubt that in present circumstances the rebuilding of Palestine is the only object which has a sufficiently strong appeal to stimulate the Jews to effective corporate action. It is the immortal service of Herzl that he was the first to see this clearly and to draw the right practical conclusions. For this reason I am convinced that every Jew who cares at all for the health and the dignity of Jewry must coöperate with all his power in the realization of Herzl's ideal.

The German Jew who works for the Jewish people and for the Jewish home in Palestine no more ceases to be a German than the Jew who becomes baptized and changes his name ceases to be a Jew. The two attachments are grounded in realities of different kinds. The antithesis is not between Jew and German, but between honesty and lack of character. He who remains true to his origin, race, and tradition will also remain loyal to the state of which he is a subject. He who is faithless to the one will also be faithless to the other.

1926

VI

The greatest enemies of Jewish national consciousness and Jewish dignity are fatty degeneration—by which I mean the loss of moral fibre which results from wealth and comfort—and a kind of spiritual dependence on the surrounding non-Jewish world, which is a consequence of the disruption of Jewish corporate life. The best in a man can be brought out only when he belongs entirely to a human group. Hence there is grave moral danger in the position of the Jew who has lost contact with his own national group and is regarded as an alien by the group among which he lives. Often enough a situation of this kind has produced a despicable and joyless egotism.

The external pressure on the Jewish people is particularly heavy at the present time. Yet our very sufferings have been wholesome. There has set in a revival of Jewish

corporate life, of which the last generation but one could not have dreamt. Under the influence of the newly awakened sense of Jewish solidarity, the colonization of Palestine, carried out by able and devoted leaders in the teeth of apparently insuperable difficulties, has already produced such favourable results that I cannot doubt its permanent effect. This work is of high value for the Jews of the whole world. Palestine will become a cultural home for all Jews, a refuge for the worst sufferers from oppression, a field of activity for the best among us, a unifying ideal and a source of spiritual health for the Jews of every country.

1929

MAXIME PIHA

Maxime Piha was born in Alexandria in 1901 of a distinguished family of Egyptian Jews with strong Franco-Italian assimilationist leanings. Several of his nearer kinsmen of the same generation took the road toward mystical Catholicism which was so fashionable and apparently alluring some years ago. Maxime Piha fought with the Italian armies during the last year of the war. He was both wounded and gassed and during a long recovery, part of which he spent in solitariness in the Sinai desert, he underwent the *teshuvah* or inner return to his people, their faith and their cause. Today he is one of the most energetic, devoted and brilliant among the intellectual Zionist leaders of Mediterranean Jewry and edits and publishes in Paris, at the greatest personal sacrifice those bi-monthly *Cahiers Juifs* (formerly *L'Illustration juive*), which are by all odds the most distinguished Jewish periodical publications in any Romance language. The following extract from one of Maxime Piha's essays is deeply significant both of the position of the cultivated young Jew in the Latin countries as well as of the saving power that, contrary to so much vulgar opinion, *both* Jewish and Christian, still flows, as it will forever flow, from the faith and being of Israel.

MAXIME PIHA

Of Youth Returning

THE society in which the young Jew lives is Christian; its rhythm is Christian; his fellows are Christians and they know precisely why. What has *he* to oppose to that Christian tradition with which all the life of western Europe is so deeply impregnated?

How they throng upon his sensibilities—the mysterious shadows and glowing windows of the great cathedrals, the candles' flame, the organ and the choir!

If he passes through a moral or physical crisis, is he not tempted to let a vow to the Virgin rise to his lips? It is not the *Sh'ma* that he utters. How often does he no more know it!

Often enough, urged on thereto by benevolent and eager teachers, he will persuade himself that "grace has touched him."

But often, too, led by the vision and the study of that Christian art by which he is surrounded and in which he is steeped, he will be impelled to study its origins; astonished by the power of embodied faith represented by a cathedral, he will seek its sources and by way of the Gospels he will discover an old book in which stand manifest for the first time those principles of human conduct which, despite all boasted progress, remain the ideals toward which mankind still strives in vain.

He has found *his* scripture.

And now he sees Israel, that stiff-necked people, slowly advancing upon its moral road, stumbling, back-sliding,

corrupted by the materialist civilizations which surround it, first a slave-folk longing in the desert for the flesh-pots of Egypt, seeking next under the guidance of Moses to hold itself erect again and to be worthy of that Law which is offered to it and which it accepts from its own free choice. Falling into error again and again and so symbolizing human weakness, this people nevertheless produces again and again out of its womb those uncompromising prophets who scourge its faults and recall to it without ceasing the mission it has accepted: election not to rights, but to duties, to the duty of its own self-purification, to the duty of setting an example to all humanity as messenger of peace and justice, as proclaimer of that *Zedaka* which is not a cold and dry justice, but the justice that is charity, that is love enlightened by reason.

Our young Jew has discovered Judaism. By way of the faith of others he has found his own.

Suddenly he becomes aware of the irony of the situation. "Thou shalt not kill." It is Israel who said that first. "Thou shalt let thy bondman and thy ox and thine ass rest." "Thou shalt leave ears on thy field that the needy may glean." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Always it is Israel who first proclaimed these things.

And once he thought he had no past of his own, that he was poor. . . . And a bitterness overcomes him at the thought of this lost treasure of his, which he might so easily never have found. . . .

Next our young assimilated Jew, leaving for a space the Bible, *his* Bible, plunges into the history of this people scattered among the nations like grain by the wind and sees these persecuted, tortured Jews accept their martyrdom as witnesses of an eternal idea and practise their *Kiddush Ha'Shem*.

Obscurely he now begins to feel his solidarity with these suffering masses, these heroes of past and present persecution, and he begins to share the unheard-of dream of re-constituting in a corner of earth in the East a new cradle

where this overdriven, dismembered, and scattered people shall find once more its unity of body and of soul.

And our young Jew now feels that he, too, has a tradition and ancestors. He is still like an uprooted palm tree whose roots seek vainly to lay hold on shifting sand. But already by an irresistible impulse these roots stretch forth toward the surface of living waters.

But already he knows himself to be a son of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, of prophets and sages, of those nameless martyrs of Tiberias and Speyer and Worms and Troyes and Kichinev. He has reforged the chain of the generations.

He has become a Jew. That epithet trailed in the mire, hurled in his face as an epithet of contempt—he drapes himself in it now as in a tunic of glory. He is a Jew.

There are various ways of being a Jew.

He who is content to be a Jew by the pressure of the world and because he cannot well do otherwise, such an one will not be very fruitful or useful either to Judaism or to humanity. For his attitude is wholly negative. Many such have remained Jews because under the onslaught of anti-Semitism they felt it beneath their human dignity to desert their people. There were such even in the Russia of the Tsars.

There are also those who have become Jews again because the world has cast them back into that Judaism from which they were in flight. That is the case of certain recent fugitives from Germany.

Lastly there are those who say: "I become a Jew when one attacks the Jews." It is well enough, but it is very little. These might be called the *Yom Kippur* Jews. Israel has need of another spirit. . . .

A man must be a Jew not through resignation, but by a voluntary act of loyalty. He must enter upon a second *brith* or covenant by the instincts of his soul and the operations of his reason.

Like our ancestors at the foot of Horeb, he who returns to us must once more freely accept the yoke. He has re-

turned to the bosom of Israel which proclaims at morn and eve the Unity of the Name and which must, if need be, die for it.

But what is Israel and what is Judaism for him who returns?

Is it a sect, a liberal society of religion, such as one would often suppose on visiting Western synagogues?

Is it a series of ritual practices, especially of a culinary character, as one would suppose from the observation of lazily conservative families?

Is it even a mere material homeland in Palestine with its forms of life slavishly imitating those of the West?

He who returns knows it to be more than all these.

He knows that Zionism is not merely the realization of a Jewish state like the other wretched succession states of the War.

He knows that Judaism is not a religion of "pots and pans," as Zangwill once said.

He knows, too, that it is not a mere sect with a scattered membership of some millions of souls.

Immersing himself ever more deeply in the life of his people our young returning Jew discovers the Talmud. He finds that it is not, as he had thought, a mere collection of tight and often inapplicable rules. Side by side with the *halachot* (prescribed ways), he discovers the treasures of the *haggadic* and *midrachic* (legendary and discursive) parts wherein the life of Israel had its true refuge and which have surely, more than any codification of prescriptive rules, contributed to the preservation of Israel. Here is the source whence an ever new vital impulse came to the wretched, persecuted ghetto Jew, living in fear and flight.

No codification of rules can help us any more. The "fence about the Law" must be a hedge of living green. . . .

Judaism is a living thing. But it has been swathed like a mummy. We must remount to a period before this was

done. We must go back to the Torah, for only by it can Israel live. But we must reinterpret the Torah by the light of the spirit of the *midrashim*. For we have come out of an historic tradition and we must re-ally ourselves with it at that point or moment when the tradition was a living and developing one.

He who returns to Judaism and desires to make it his own often finds lifeless ritual and dead practice. He needs a usable past and a vital present. He does not find it in the mere sloth of orthodox usage. Nor does he find it in that movement of reform which reduces Judaism to a comfortable liberal "faith" in which the Sabbath is transferred to Sunday and the Feast of Lights becomes a substitute for Christmas and in which the people Israel and its unity, instead of being the living core of things, is relegated to a past or to a metaphysical future.

It is none of these things that can satisfy him who returns. He desires a living tradition which shall be his own and with the development of which he himself can coöperate. For he must *live* his Judaism and teach his children how to live it.

He conceives of Israel as a living being, flesh and spirit, pushing its roots into the immemorial past, living its own historic life through the ages, as a *people*, in brief, a group of human beings of common origin, with its own living language and culture and common traditions which, though they have evolved and changed in form, have always and do still follow the same spiritual direction toward the concept of Unity, of *Echad*.

That concept of Unity, conceived under the silence of the desert stars, is the great gift of Israel to humanity. The *Echad* is the Absolute with which man enters into direct communion without the need of any material mediation.

He who returns knows how hard it is to maintain himself upon that peak of being. But he soon discovers that Israel sanctifies and blesses life at every instant, operates within life with all its difficulties, that it seeks and supplies

life's fulness through the harmonious accord of all the faculties of being, since it causes the divine to manifest itself in the concreteness of human living.

It is that love of life that is characteristic of Israel. The merit of the individual consists in his striving after perfection which works for and within the collectivity. But Jewish purity is not renunciation nor is Jewish chastity a mortification of the flesh. The Law is the direction of the good life by the sanctification of all human action in joy. This ancient and living idea has been too often obscured.

Judaism is a yoke to take upon oneself. But it is a yoke that can be born in freedom and serenity and a just pride.

The sanctified life of Judaism is a life of joy and Israel can be reborn out of itself.

LOUIS DEMBITZ BRANDEIS

The American contributors to this volume are properly led by the venerable figure of Louis D. Brandeis (b. Louisville, Ky., 1856), Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is worth recalling a passage from a letter in which the late President Wilson recommended the appointment of Justice Brandeis to the Supreme Court in order to point out once more to Americans, both Jews and Christians, the type of mind which, again as in the case of Albert Einstein, by a free act of intellectual and moral decision, allied itself with the renaissance of the Jewish people and, above all, with the Zionist cause. Mr. Wilson wrote: "I nominated Mr. Brandeis for the Supreme Court because it was and is my deliberate judgment that, of all the men now at the bar . . . he is exceptionally qualified. I cannot speak too highly of his impartial, impersonal, orderly, and constructive mind, his rare analytical powers, his deep human sympathy, his profound acquaintance with the historical roots of our institutions and insight into their spirit. . . . This friend of justice and of men will ornament the high court of which we are all so justly proud."

This "friend of the just and lover of the right," as Mr. Wilson called him in another document, undertook deliberately to examine the Zionist case in 1910. His conviction of its justness and rightness grew until on March 20, 1913, Mr. Brandeis publicly presided at a Zionist mass meeting in Boston that was addressed by Nahum Sokolow. Eighteen months later Mr. Brandeis was elected chairman of the Zionist Provisional Emergency Committee. His magnificent and selfless and untiring services to the cause since

then are part of the history of American Jewry and of the Zionist movement. The following pages are reprinted (by the personal permission of Mr. Justice Brandeis) from *The Jewish Problem: How to Solve It* (new ed., Cleveland, 1934).

LOUIS DEMBITZ BRANDEIS

I

Democracy and Nationality

WHY is it that liberalism has failed to eliminate the anti-Jewish prejudice? It is because the liberal movement has not yet brought *full* liberty. Enlightened countries grant to the individual equality before the law; but they fail still to recognize the equality of whole peoples or nationalities. We seek to protect as individuals those constituting a minority; but we fail to realize that protection cannot be complete unless group equality also is recognized.

Deeply imbedded in every people is the desire for full development—the longing, as Mazzini phrased it “to elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the pyramid of history.” Nationality, like democracy, has been one of the potent forces making for man’s advance during the past hundred years. The assertion of nationality has infused whole peoples with hope, manhood, and self-respect. It has ennobled and made purposeful millions of lives. It offered them a future, and in doing so revived and capitalized all that was valuable in their past. The assertion of nationality raised Ireland from the slough of despondency. It roused Southern Slavs to heroic deeds. It created gallant Belgium. It freed Greece. It gave us united Italy. It manifested itself even among the free peoples—like the Welsh—who had no grievance, but who gave expression to their nationality through the revival of the old Cymric tongue. Each of these peoples developed be-

cause, as Mazzini said, they were enabled to proclaim "to the world that they also live, think, love and labour for the benefit of all."

In the past it has been generally assumed that the full development of one people necessarily involved its domination over others. Strong nationalities are apt to become convinced that by such domination only does civilization advance. Strong nationalities assume their own superiority, and come to believe that they possess the divine right to subject other peoples to their sway. Soon the belief in the existence of such a right becomes converted into a conviction that duty exists to enforce it. Wars of aggrandizement follow as a natural result of this belief.

This attitude of certain nationalities is the exact correlative of the position which was generally assumed by the strong in respect to other individuals before democracy became a common possession. The struggles of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries both in peace and in war were devoted largely to overcoming that position as to individuals. In establishing the equal right of every person to development; it became clear that equal opportunity for all involves this necessary limitation: Each man may develop himself so far, but only so far, as his doing so will not interfere with the exercise of a like right by all others. Thus liberty came to mean the right to enjoy life, to acquire property, to pursue happiness in such manner and to such extent as the exercise of the right in each is consistent with the exercise of a like right by every other of our fellow citizens. Liberty thus defined underlies twentieth-century democracy. Liberty thus defined exists in a large part of the Western World. And even where this equal right of each individual has not yet been accepted as a political right, its ethical claim is gaining recognition. Democracy rejected the proposal of the superman who should rise through sacrifice of the many. It insists that the full development of each individual is not only a right,

but a duty to society; and that our best hope for civilization lies not in uniformity, but in wide differentiation.

The movements of the last century have proved that whole peoples have individuality no less marked than that of the single person; that the individuality of a people is irrepressible, and that the misnamed internationalism which seeks the obliteration of nationalities or peoples is unattainable. The new nationalism proclaims that each race or people, like each individual, has a right and duty to develop, and that only through such differentiated development will high civilization be attained. Not until these principles of nationalism, like those of democracy, are generally accepted, will liberty be fully attained, and minorities be secure in their rights. But there is ground for hope that the establishment of these principles will come as one of the compensations of the present war; and with it, the solution of the Jewish Problem.

II

Nations and Nationalities

The difference between a nation and a nationality is clear; but it is not always observed. Likeness between members is the essence of nationality; but the members of a nation may be very different. A nation may be composed of many nationalities, as some of the most successful nations are. An instance of this is the British nation, with its division into English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish at home; with the French in Canada; and throughout the Empire, scores of other nationalities. Other examples are furnished by the Swiss nation with its German, French, and Italian sections; by the Belgian nation composed of Flemings and Walloons; and by the American nation which comprises nearly all the white nationalities. The unity of a nationality is a fact of nature. The unity into a nation is largely the work of man. The false doctrine that nation and nationality

must be made coextensive is the cause of some of our greatest tragedies. It is, in large part, the cause also of the present war. It has led, on the one hand, to cruel, futile attempts at enforced assimilation, like the Russianizing of Finland and Poland, and the Prussianizing of Posen, Schleswig-Holstein, and Alsace-Lorraine. It has led, on the other hand, to those Panistic movements which are a cloak for territorial ambitions. As a nation may develop though composed of many nationalities, so a nationality may develop though forming parts of several nations. The essential in either case is recognition of the equal rights of each nationality.

W. Allison Philips recently defined nationality as "an extensive aggregate of persons, conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences, or qualities which make them feel themselves a distinct people." And he adds: "If we examine the composition of the several nationalities we find these elements: race, language, religion, common habitat, common conditions, mode of life and manners, political association. The elements are, however, never all present at the same time, and none of them is essential. . . . A common habitat and common conditions are doubtless powerful influences at times in determining nationality; but what part do they play in that of the Jews or the Greeks, or the Irish in dispersion?"

See how this high authority assumes without question that the Jews are, despite their dispersion, a distinct nationality; and he groups us with the Greeks or the Irish—two other peoples of marked individuality. Can it be doubted that we Jews—aggregating 14,000,000 people—are "an extensive aggregate of persons"; that we are "conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences and qualities which make us *feel* ourselves, a distinct people," whether we admit it or not?

It is no answer to this evidence of nationality to declare that the Jews are not an absolutely pure race. There has, of course, been some intermixture of foreign blood in the

3,000 years which constitute our historic period. But, owing to persecution and prejudice, the intermarriages with non-Jews which occurred, have resulted merely in taking away many from the Jewish community. Intermarriage has brought few additions. Therefore the percentage of foreign blood in the Jews of today is very low. Probably no important European race is as pure.

But common race is only one of the elements which determine nationality. Conscious community of sentiments, common experiences, common qualities, are equally, perhaps more, important. Religion, traditions, and customs bound us together, though scattered throughout the world. The similarity of experience tended to produce similarity of qualities and community of sentiments. Common suffering so intensified the feeling of brotherhood as to overcome largely all the influences making for diversification. The segregation of the Jews was so general, so complete, and so long continued as to intensify our "peculiarities" and make them almost ineradicable.

We recognize that with each child the aim of education should be to develop his own individuality, not to make him an imitator, not to assimilate him to others. Shall we fail to recognize this truth when applied to whole peoples? And what people in the world has shown greater individuality than the Jews? Has any a nobler past? Does any possess common ideas better worth expressing? Has any marked traits worthier of development? Of all the peoples in the world those of two tiny states stand preëminent as contributors to our present civilization—the Greeks and the Jews. The Jews gave to the world its three greatest religions, reverence for law, and the highest conceptions of morality. Never before has the value of our contribution been so generally recognized. Our teaching of brotherhood and righteousness has, under the name of democracy and social justice, become the twentieth-century striving of America and of western Europe. Our conception of law is embodied in the American Constitution which proclaims

this to be a "government of laws and not of men." And for the triumph of our other great teaching—the doctrine of peace, this cruel war is paving the way.

While every other people is striving for development by asserting its nationality, and a great war is making clear the value of small nations, shall we voluntarily yield to anti-Semitism, and instead of solving our "problem" end it by ignoble suicide? Surely this is no time for Jews to despair. Let us make clear to the world that we too are a nationality striving for equal rights, to life and to self-expression. That this should be our course has been recently expressed by high non-Jewish authority. Thus Seton-Watson, speaking of the probable results of the war, said:

"There are good grounds for hoping that it (the war) will also give a new and healthy impetus to Jewish national policy, grant freer play to their splendid qualities, and enable them to shake off the false shame which has led men who ought to be proud of their Jewish race to assume so many alien disguises and to accuse of anti-Semitism those who refuse to be deceived by mere appearances. It is high time that the Jews should realize that few things do more to foster anti-Semitic feeling than this very tendency to sail under false colours and conceal their true identity. The Zionists and the orthodox Jewish Nationalists have long ago won the respect and admiration of the world. No race has ever defied assimilation so stubbornly and so successfully; and the modern tendency of individual Jews to repudiate what is one of their chief glories suggests an almost comic resolve to fight against the course of nature."

III

Zionism

Standing upon this broad foundation of nationality, Zionism aims to give it full development. Let us bear

clearly in mind what Zionism is, or rather what it is not.

It is not a movement to remove all the Jews of the world compulsorily to Palestine. In the first place there are 14,000,000 Jews, and Palestine would not accommodate more than one-third of that number. In the second place, it is not a movement to compel anyone to go to Palestine. It is essentially a movement to give to the Jew more, not less freedom—it aims to enable the Jews to exercise the same right now exercised by practically every other people in the world: To live at their option either in the land of their fathers or in some other country; a right which members of small nations as well as of large, which Irish, Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian, or Belgian, may now exercise as fully as Germans or English.

Zionism seeks to establish in Palestine, for such Jews as choose to go and remain there, and for their descendants, a legally secured home, where they may live together and lead a Jewish life, where they may expect ultimately to constitute a majority of the population, and may look forward to what we should call home rule. The Zionists seek to establish this home in Palestine because they are convinced that the undying longing of Jews for Palestine is a fact of deepest significance; that it is a manifestation in the struggle for existence by an ancient people which had established its right to live—a people whose three thousand years of civilization has produced a faith, culture, and individuality which enable them to contribute largely in the future, as they had in the past, to the advance of civilization and that it is not a right merely but a duty of the Jewish nationality to survive and develop. They believe that there only can Jewish life be fully protected from the forces of disintegration; that there alone can the Jewish spirit reach its full and natural development; and that by securing for those Jews who wish to settle in Palestine the opportunity to do so, not only those Jews, but all other Jews, will be benefited and that the long perplexing Jewish Problem will, at last, find solution.

They believe that to accomplish this, it is not necessary that the Jewish population of Palestine be large as compared with the whole number of Jews in the world; for throughout centuries when the Jewish influence was greatest—during the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman Empires, only a relatively small part of the Jews lived in Palestine; and only a small part of the Jews returned from Babylon when the Temple was rebuilt.

Since the destruction of the Temple, nearly two thousand years ago, the longing for Palestine has been ever present with the Jew. It was the hope of a return to the land of his fathers that buoyed up the Jew amidst persecution, and for the realization of which the devout ever prayed. Until a generation ago this was a hope merely—a wish piously prayed for, but not worked for. The Zionist movement is idealistic, but it is also essentially practical. It seeks to realize that hope; to make the dream of a Jewish life in a Jewish land come true as other great dreams of the world have been realized—by men working with devotion, intelligence, and self-sacrifice. It was thus that the dream of Italian independence and unity, after centuries of vain hope, came true through the efforts of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour; that the dream of Greek, of Bulgarian, and of Serbian independence became facts; that the dream of home rule in Ireland has just been realized.

The rebirth of the Jewish nation is no longer a mere dream. It is in process of accomplishment in a most practical way, and the story is a wonderful one. A generation ago a few Jewish emigrants from Russia and from Rumania, instead of proceeding westward to this hospitable country where they might easily have secured material prosperity, turned eastward for the purpose of settling in the land of their fathers.

To the worldly wise these efforts at colonization appeared very foolish. Nature and man presented obstacles in Palestine which appeared almost insuperable; and the colonists were in fact ill-equipped for their task, save in

their spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice. The land, harassed by centuries of misrule, was treeless and apparently sterile; and it was infested with malaria. The government offered them no security as to either life or property. The colonists themselves were not only unfamiliar with the character of the country, but were ignorant of the farmer's life which they proposed to lead; for the Jews of Russia and Rumania had been generally denied the opportunity of owning or working land. Furthermore, these colonists were not inured to the physical hardships to which the life of a pioneer is necessarily subjected. To these hardships and malaria many succumbed. Those who survived were long confronted with failure. But at last success came. Within a generation these Jewish Pilgrim Fathers, and those who followed them, have succeeded in establishing these two fundamental propositions:

First: That Palestine is fit for the modern Jew.

Second: That the modern Jew is fit for Palestine.

Over forty self-governing Jewish colonies attested to this remarkable achievement.

This land, treeless a generation ago, supposed to be sterile and hopelessly arid, has been shown to have been treeless and sterile only because of man's misrule. It has been shown to be capable of becoming again a land "flowing with milk and honey." Oranges and grapes, olives and almonds, wheat and other cereals, are now growing there in profusion.

This material development has been attended by a spiritual and social development no less extraordinary; a development in education, in health, and in social order; and in the character and habits of the population. Perhaps the most extraordinary achievement of Jewish nationalism is the revival of the Hebrew language, which has again become a language of the common intercourse of men. The Hebrew tongue, called a dead language for nearly two thousand years, has, in the Jewish colonies and in

Jerusalem, become again the living mother tongue. The effect of this common language in unifying the Jews is, of course, great; for the Jews of Palestine came literally from all the lands of the earth, each speaking, except for the use of Yiddish, the language of the country from which he came, and remaining in the main, almost a stranger to the others. But the effect of the renaissance of the Hebrew tongue is far greater than that of unifying the Jews. It is a potent factor in reviving the essentially Jewish spirit.

Our Jewish Pilgrim Fathers have laid the foundation. It remains for us to build the superstructure.

IV

Zionism and Patriotism

Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his state, and of his city; for being loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed towards advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

Note what Seton-Watson says:

"America is full of nationalities which, while accepting with enthusiasm their new American citizenship, nevertheless look to some centre in the Old World as the source and inspiration of their national culture and traditions. The most typical instance is the feeling of the American

Jew for Palestine which may well become a focus for his *déclassés* kinsmen in other parts of the world."

There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the Temple have the Jews in spirit and in ideals been so fully in harmony with the noblest aspirations of the country in which they lived.

America's fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jewish fundamental law more than twenty-five hundred years ago. America's insistent demand in the twentieth century is for social justice. That also has been the Jews' striving for ages. Their affliction as well as their religion has prepared the Jews for effective democracy. Persecution broadened their sympathies. It trained them in patient endurance, in self-control, and in sacrifice. It made them think as well as suffer. It deepened the passion for righteousness.

Indeed, loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further, so that in America as elsewhere the sons of the race may in future live lives and do deeds worthy of their ancestors.

STEPHEN SAMUEL WISE

Although the position of Rabbi Wise in American and Jewish life is rather that of leader and statesman than that of thinker, no book of this kind could dispense with the authority of his voice and character. Dr. Wise was born in Budapest in 1874 and graduated from Columbia University in 1892. He served various congregations between 1893 and 1907, when he founded the Free Synagogue of New York. He is the founder and president of the Jewish Institute of Religion and the founder of the Zionist Organization of America. But these outer facts are only symbols of the moral power that have made Stephen Wise the most commanding figure in the whole history of the American rabbinate and one of the preëminent leaders of world Jewry and of the Zionist movement. He has gained this position by the uncompromising passion of his convictions; by his stintless love of his people and of humanity; by his unsparing spending of himself for the causes that he has embraced. His undiplomatic impetuosity and the occasional contradictoriness of his political views and policies are but the necessary defects of his spiritual gallantry and wholeness of heart. Though a professional orator of very high distinction, he nearly always, as Maurice Samuel has admirably put it, "transcends his oratorical training and catches at the inmost, unuttered needs of his audience, so that at moments it may be said of him that a people takes shelter in his voice." Beneath the fiery publicist, speaker, and leader, moreover, there is a human being of extraordinary sweetness, capable of the grace of humility, of the abnegation of self which, very properly, he refuses to practise in that world of public action in which the self and the cause are identical. His power over men is drawn,

when they do not know it, from the instinctive practice of *Zedaka* which defines the man. Stephen Wise is, of course, unthinkable apart from the Zionist philosophy and cause. But the point is just this: that both the loftiest characters as well as the loftiest minds in modern Jewry are unthinkable without it and that those few who will not yield to its compulsion merely scatter the forgotten roads of life.

STEPHEN SAMUEL WISE

Rededication

I AM not prepared to say, after twenty-five years which have witnessed cataclysmic changes in world affairs as well as Jewish, that I would subscribe *verbatim et literatim* to our program of twenty-five years ago. I have not, I trust, lost my pioneering zeal as a Jewish Liberal. But with the years I have come to a deeper understanding of the value of the tradition-conserving phases of our common Jewish heritage. I have come to recognize, however tenaciously I must share the liberal mood, that the conservative spirit has its rightful place and uses in the Jewish totality. I have come to see that the weakness and virtue of much of so-called Liberal Judaism in America have been due to the absence of a vigorously challenging and vitally contestant conservatism. Our quarrel is not with Jews who are different, but with Jews who are indifferent; not with Jews who wish to preserve and magnify certain aspects of the Jewish totality, but with Jews, such as they are, who would minimize, if not destroy, everything distinctively Jewish; not with Jews who would conserve and safeguard too much, but with Israelites who would preserve nothing save their own skins.

Above all, within the past quarter-century, a movement has developed in Jewish life which calls not so much for definition as for commitment—Zionism. Personally identified with it and associated with its founders since its beginnings, I did not quite see, when we began our work, as I see today, that Zionism is become not only the Jewish

hope and refuge, but the touchstone by which to appraise the reality and content of the relation of the individual Jew to the body of Israel. For Zionism means infinitely more than the building or rebuilding of the Jewish National Home. It means the Jewish will to live Jewishly *versus* the wish to survive Jewishly or un-Jewishly, to create a Jewish centre in the Judea of history whence shall radiate Jewish stimulus and inspiration to Jews wherever they may dwell. Zionism is the Jewish answer to cowardly counsels of Jewish suicide. Zionism is the collective will of the Jewish people to endure and to create. Hence I have conceived it to be one of my primary obligations to give a goodly measure of my strength to the furtherance of this cause.

They who have taken over the banners of Reform do not seem capable of comprehending that what were the living battle cries of Orthodoxy and Reform are become nothing more than dead echoes of obsolete issues. Reform is become little more than a new and nerveless Orthodoxy, and even so-called Orthodoxy is in practice become partially Reform. Much of what passes today for Liberal Judaism is a merely mimetic echo of a one-time liberal spirit. It has long forsworn the aim though it will not yield the name of Liberalism. One supreme question, upon the answer to which all else depends, runs thus: "Are Jews to be satisfied to be at best nothing more than an obsolescent group of Semitic Unitarians, or are they resolved to carry on as the inheritors of a rich and complete racial tradition, inclusive of the simply reasonable, ethical faith known as Judaism?" We have chosen to ally ourselves with those forces which are affirmatively and uncompromisingly Jewish. So much may be said only for the doctrinal attitude of Jewish Reform, which moves steadily though perhaps unwittingly toward the minimization of every aspect of Judaism, save the religious or, to be more accurate, creedal. Jewish Reform, in its dread of Jewish nationalism, tends

in truth to a process of Jewish ecclesiasticization which is at least as remote from the essence of Jewishness as the most relentless secularization.

If Jewish nationalism be, as is alleged, like unto the nationalism of all nations, Jewish Reform is in peril of drifting toward that which never was on land or sea of things Jewish, a Jewish Church, though not in the sense in which Church is commonly used. The Synagogue once was and still is a part or phase of the Jewish totality. *But Israel never was a church.* The people of Israel had a church or faith as the English have a church. But the interpenetration of the life of the people by religion or faith never resulted in the substitution of the Ecclesia for the people. This is not a matter of doctrinal dialectic. There can and ought to be no future for Reform if it continue to construe Judaism solely under the forms of doctrine, or, at best, religion, thus severing itself from the body of Israel. Reform, if it become, as it is fast becoming, a Jewish sect, may for a time survive as a sect. But it will cease to be Jewish, as every Jewish sect has passed, save for the Phari-saïc, which was not a sect but a vital movement of a people in the interests of national as well as religious self-preservation. Jewish Reform began as a movement of liberation within Judaism. It is in gravest peril of becoming a movement for emancipation from Jewishness.

The leaders of Jewish Reform—as far as there are such—are taking upon themselves a terrible responsibility in providing a door, even though it be a church door, that swings outward from the house of Israel. A living, growing, increasingly Jewish Liberalism is, I trust, ours. But I can have no part in a Jewish movement which is bound to move from centre to periphery of the Jewish circle, a movement that is destined ultimately to attempt the replacement of a people's life in all its richness and colourfulness, by some manner of colourless monotheism, part Anglican and part Lutheran. Viewing this, ours can no longer be an unquestioning adherence to Reform, unless it

become possible to be certain that it makes for the cherishing of all Jewish values and the safeguarding of the very substance of Israel's life as a people. Whether we are a people may be left for discussion to debating societies. The decision has been reached by Jew and non-Jew alike. As far as it has been reached by the non-Jew, whether in good-will or in ill-will, it is not binding upon us. But it is significantly confirmatory of the instinct of the people as long as the people is unprepared to exchange the subtleties or even verities of theological doctrine for the realities of a people's life.

But something more requires to be said. There are those who may ask why should Liberal Jews maintain a Synagogue, seeing that in a very real sense Israel is prior to the Synagogue and were conceivable though infinitely poorer without it. Putting it more simply, the query has come from within and without our synagogue ranks, why not have Jews assemble in secular rather than in religious fashion, in order to give expression to their sense of loyalties historic and to those purely ethical concepts and social ideals which underlie that history?

I cannot speak for others who may feel that a definitely non-religious movement that shall embody and in turn commend the ethical idealism of Israel, most nearly meets their own sense of Jewish need, an ethical movement which shall be as frankly and eagerly Jewish as the Ethical Culture movement is unfrankly non-Jewish and frankly universalistic. I have the conviction that there are those—and they include some of the choicest spirits in the Jewish household—who are waiting for and who may yet establish such a movement, if movement it is to be. The heart of the Ethical movement lies not in the non-Jewishness of its catholic and comprehensive fellowship, but in the Jewishness of that ethical affirmation and passion which are supremely embodied in the personality of its great founder. Must the Felix Adlers, great and small—and their number grows from year to year—be lost to us because of verbal-

isms? To name only a few, Adler and Flexner, Brandeis and Cardozo, find no place for themselves in the Synagogue, and these are not only among the major prophets of our land and age, but deeply spiritual, mystic guardians of the innermost light of the good life. This light is a part of their native Jewish endowment.

Speaking for myself, I could not minister at such an altar! And that, not because of traditional compulsions and loyalties, but because of my own personal need of a shrine before which men may bow their heads and lift up their hearts in the sense or consciousness of the Eternal Presence! I have and shall have no quarrel with such Jews as break with the Jewish tradition only in so far as they are or believe themselves to be unable to subscribe to the forms of prayer, though there be those among them whose life is prayer at its highest. And I consider it the saddest of the fatalities of Reform Judaism virtually and un-Jewishly to shut out seers and sages and saints who cannot utter *Sh'ma Yisrael*, though their life be the very glory of Israel, while at the same time the Synagogue offers refuge and dignity and power to not a few whose paganism is cynically inclusive of the accents of the *Sh'ma*.

Twenty-five years ago it seemed to us, as it still does, that the American Synagogue, especially the Reform Temple, was becoming or even had become a class institution visited by the middle classes, supported or patronized by the rich, and, as often happens, by their estates, and almost wholly exclusive of the poor or masses—very much like the Episcopal Church in our land. Nothing, it seemed to us, could have been farther from the spirit or genius of the Synagogue than to suffer it to become a class institution, to use current terminology.

To me there seemed something æsthetically ugly and ethically false in a Jewish House of God which observed and maintained all the divisive forms of the world without. To dwell for a moment on lesser things, the pew

system, which, whatever may be said in its favour, segregated the poor from the rich, giving to the rich the places of honour and conspicuousness, and to the poor the places of discomfort and humiliation. Our insistence of that earlier day has been heeded by many synagogues throughout the land which have abolished the unspeakably vulgar system that carries into the doors of the House of God every iniquity and inequality of economic status. In the same way we dealt with the abominable system of dues or taxation which not only killed and kills the spirit of voluntariness in giving, but by indirection bestows the power of control upon the heavily taxed—that is, the well-to-do or rich. I may, after a lapse of years, retell the tale of the great German Bible scholar who, after the service in one of our Jewish Reform cathedrals, rather bitterly asked: "*Gibt's denn keine arme Juden?*" The honest answer would have been: "*Ja, aber nicht unter uns!*" No, the poor Jew has no place in the American Temple or Synagogue as it is constituted. And one grieves to say there are Conservative and Orthodox Synagogues and centers which have bettered or worsened the instruction of the Reform Temple in the matter of exaggerated dues and prohibitive taxes laid upon those who would have part therein. Our refusal to assent to this method of synagogue maintenance, so deeply foreign to the essence of things Jewish, has had consequences no less important to us than to those to whom we from the outset addressed ourselves. The Free Synagogue became and remains a cross-section of American Israel, including within its ranks representatives of all groups and classes, and, above all, of the masses, who have for a generation felt shut out from the communion or, putting it bluntly, from the economic structure of the temple.

No secularist can believe more earnestly than I do that in our country the church must no more seek to attain political power than the State may attempt to control the

church or churches. Each must be kept in its separate sphere. And nothing but evil can result from the attempt at dominance of either by the other. But the traditional divorce of Church and State does not exempt religious institutions from the duty of lifting up their voices and making themselves felt whenever moral causes are at stake. Civics has not ceased to be a branch or phase of morals—thus runs the uncontradicted Aristotelian tradition. The danger in our time is not that Church and Synagogue will speak, but that they will continue to be silent in the midst of the sodden corruption which mars the life of many of our great cities. Are Church and Synagogue to be dumb and neutral, let us say, like chambers of commerce whose primary if not only concern is or seems to be the economic or material interest? Dumb when the affairs of city and state, polluted by gain-mad officials, need the cleansing and unafraid word of religion and its clear vision of the common good that none may mar?

The need of pulpit freedom in the prophetic tradition of forthright and unafraid speech comes to light even more strikingly in the economic and industrial sphere as well as in the realm of international relations. Here, above all, it is that the preacher, who humbly conceives himself to be the utterer of truth rather than the author of a message, finds his freedom imperilled by invasion, the liberty of his pulpit most threatened. That is to say, provided he be in earnest, provided he think of his pulpit not as a soft berth but as a stern duty, provided he is ready to interpret religion in the terms of the good life for all as well as for some.

It has been here, namely in relation to economic and industrial problems, that the rightfulness of pulpit freedom has oftenest come, during our years together, under some manner of pressure and threat. And that from those who honestly fail to see why the pulpit, which is necessarily inexpert in the field of economics, should presume to urge counsel in relation to such palpably economic

questions as that of wages and hours of work. Parenthetically it may be observed that the Realty Board of Judea doubtless found Isaiah to be ill-advised and mischievously intrusive as well as absurdly inexperienced when he inveighed against adding house to house and field to field. How untimely and unprogressive the Mosaic Law must have sounded which decreed the return of the land, under all circumstances, to its original ownership whenever the fiftieth year rolled around.

The pulpit has no right to prescribe a wage scale. But that Church or Synagogue is utterly false to elementary obligation which is silent, as Church and Synagogue normally are silent in the presence of a cruel and ruthlessly insufficient wage. And when it is alleged that industry cannot allow "a living wage," the obvious answer for the Church, whatever chambers of commerce may pompously aver, is that in such case something is radically wrong with industry. And if industry cannot assure the necessities of decent living to the workers, then is there need for a basic revision, if not revolution, of industry. The question really is whether Church and Synagogue shall be satisfied to regard the laws of religious and ethical life as null and void in the presence of the so-called iron laws of trade and industry. Or shall these insist that in the last analysis even iron laws must yield before the unshakable necessity of regarding as humanly irrepealable the right of the sons and daughters of men to live?

I single out one further problem for the special and personally grievous reason that in relation thereto I have failed more completely than in any other phase of my life's ministry. And it behooves me to set down my failures with something of the vigour with which I have outlined the causes of my unchanging adherence. Like most teachers of religion, Jewish or Christian, I was, prior to the World War, a more or less active champion of the peace cause. The war came and, to my everlasting regret, I took sides

I gave my public and private support to what I believed to have been the less guilty of the two groups of warring nations. I believed at the time that the war would prove to be the last war, and that it should and must be entered by our own nation as the war to end war. I was not deceived herein by the leader of the nation. I knew him well enough to be justified in saying that he truly, though erringly, believed that this war would with our help end wars. He did not, perhaps could not, foresee what we have come to know, that the World War *could not end war, because war never did end war, because war never will end war*. War breeds war and not peace. The war to end war can never be. It is not contriteness alone that moves me to make this confession. I make it because it leads to consequences which are of the largest import to me and may prove, in time, to be deeply important to my people.

Without reservation or equivocation, I herewith affirm that the pulpit of the Free Synagogue, while I stand in it, will never give its support to war, to any war whatsoever, to war with any other people or nation. I would no more support a war to crush Hitlerism than a war for the strengthening of Jewish claims in Palestine. Though I bore no arms, I gave the fullest measure of my private and public support, that is to say, my material and moral support—to the United States and the allied nations in the World War. I will never do so again.

Far off though the day of war may be for us, it cannot be too soon to make one pertinent observation. If war should come, and I find it necessary to utter my unyielding opposition thereto, not a few of my people would share my conviction and still imagine that as Jews they could not afford to take a stand as pacifists. Without discussing the rights and wrongs of war at this time, I feel justified in warning my fellow-Jews against the harm they do themselves and their country by forswearing a conviction the moment it becomes inconvenient or difficult or unpopular to hold it. If we are to be fearful of hurt which courage

and nobility may do us, then we do not deserve to go on as a people. Whatever of moral greatness inheres in the history of Israel arises out of the truth that our people were ever content to be a people of hopeless minorities and lost causes. Man may resist and deny and banish and smite the prophet for an hour. But the future belongs to him.

LOUIS LIPSKY

One of the staunchest and ablest of American Zionist leaders, Louis Lipsky was born in Rochester, N. Y., in 1876. Although for years an active dramatic critic and editor, the rebirth of the Jewish people has burned at the centre of Lipsky's mind. In this cause he has been untiring as organizer, writer, and orator for more than thirty years. He collaborated with the late Joseph Jacobs in editing the *American Hebrew* in 1899. He edited the *Maccabean Monthly*, then the official organ of the American Zionist Federation. In 1921 he was elected chairman of the administrative committee of the Zionist Organization of America, of which he was president (as well as editor of *The New Palestine*) 1924-1930. He became a member of the World Executive of the Zionist Organization in 1923. He was re-elected at the Prague Congress in 1933 and in 1935 elected honorary president of the American organization. His collected writings were published in three volumes in 1927.

LOUIS LIPSKY

*There Is Singing on Mount Scopus!*¹

MOUNT SCOPUS is the eye of *Eretz Israel*. Looking to the east, clearly outlined against the sky, you see the Mountains of Moab and the Jordan River winding its way sluggishly into the silent Dead Sea. To the north you see the port of Haifa, the crescent-shaped Bay of Acre, and the white city of Acre projecting into the Mediterranean Sea. To the west, the Plain of Esdraelon (broad, warm, fecund, carpeted with color), Jaffa, and again the Mediterranean Sea. Behind you, southward, not far from where you stand, you look down, somewhat, on the old city of Jerusalem, rimmed by the great wall, the mosque of Omar rising above the piles of corrugated stone. Mount Scopus is the all-embracing eye of *Eretz Israel*.

Upon this mountain, eighteen hundred and fifty-five years ago, the Roman general, Titus Vespasian, pitched his tent the better to direct the attack of his cohorts upon Jerusalem. It was from Mount Scopus the order came to pierce the walls with battering-rams, to place ladders against them, and for hordes of Roman soldiers to grapple with the brave defenders upon the parapets. Resistance was gradually broken down. The invaders set fire to the Holy Temple. Jerusalem was taken amid the slaughter of thousands of zealots, who resisted to the last. Masses of the vanquished were taken captive and dragged to Rome, where they were set in mortal combat with wild animals,

¹On the occasion of the Inauguration of the Hebrew University, March, 1925.

and their blood crimsoned the sand of the arenas. As a memorial of victory, Titus Vespasian caused an arch to be erected in Rome, and a coin was struck off in his honor on which were inscribed the words, *Judæa Devicta*.

The wandering Jew, bearing the stigma of national defeat, has traversed the world these eighteen hundred and fifty-five years, nursing the hope that in God's time he would return to the scene of his former glory. He bore with fortitude and patience the burdens of life rendered all but intolerable by continued oppression. The ever-green sprig of memory made suffering endurable. Faith gave incentive to struggle. Before the storms of adversity, conscious of his inner strength, he bent his shoulders and lowered his head, but his spirit was never conquered. He made terms with conditions, but never lost hope. He embodied his hope in precept, in prayer, in ceremony, in physical habit, in the everyday duties of life. He determined to outlast enmity. He pressed through adversity in order that when the Day of Days arrived, he would be identifiably the man of Judæa, able to recover the straight back, the clear upright head, the ability to begin again the making of new life, with a consciousness of living traditions and ideals still virile and forceful.

The great Empire of Rome today is ashes. It is the dust of a dim past. The conqueror, Titus Vespasian, owes his place in history to the act that sent the Jews once more out of their land. Titus is tyrant forever in Jewish legend, a figure of incarnate cruelty. He is the god of the machine that intervened, unknowingly, in the drama of Jewish life, and through his intervention sent the ball of Jewish existence rolling into the tragic depths of a long and terrible exile. The Arch of Titus crumbles. And on the mountain which saw Jerusalem in flames, the descendants of *Judæa Devicta* gather in the year 1925 to dedicate an edifice which proclaims to the world the Return of the Exile, again head up, again shoulders erect, the light of renewed life

glistening in his eyes. They dedicate the Return on Mount Scopus.

From Jabneh to Mount Scopus. The defeated Jochanan ben Zakkai petitioned the Roman usurper for permission to retain a Jewish school of learning, and the petition was granted. It was an act of grace. It implied admission of defeat. It was a supplication and a prayer. It gave opportunity within sight of the Hills that had been desecrated to gather together the débris of defeat, to preserve the learning of Jewish life, to husband it in order that life (quiescent, unoffending, unaggressive) might be retained. Self-restraint held the passion of hatred in leash; the battlefield was abandoned; the resistance of endurance supplanted the resistance of arms. Terms were made with the conqueror. Jabneh was a seed planted deep into the ground. At the very moment of destruction, it was the beginning of the Return inevitably to be realized.

Today, the noonday sun brilliantly illuminating the scene, in the sight of a wondering world, the Jewish people—Judæa Victorious—return to Mount Scopus under right sanctioned by fifty-one nations of the world (not privilege) and in the presence of representatives of all that is liberal in our present-day civilization, dedicate the Hebrew National University, which is to assemble the renascent Jewish culture and ideals that have outlived all compromise, that have outlived all the devious turns and twists and degradations which Exile has imposed upon us.

It is the dedication of the university of a returning Jewish nation. Such an institution cannot be created *ex nihilo*, with words or high intentions. This edifice could not be dedicated unless beneath its visible props there had been laid a foundation upon which it could rest. All hail to the persistence of the writers of Hebrew, who, in spite of conditions that tried their powers of endurance, in spite of temptation, the pressure of physical need, followed the

light of their souls and created for us a living literature without which a Hebrew University would have been unthinkable. All hail to the makers of the Hebrew language, who took the rigid words of the old language, rent them open with loving strength, gave them flexibility, vigour and fluency, and made it possible for the children, blossoming under the Palestine sun, to become the living carriers of the new Hebraic life. All respect to the Biluists who came to Palestine and with their lacerated fingers dug into the soil and established the first outpost of the Jewish Return. Every Chalutz who drained a swamp, laid a road, dug into the soil, built a house, contributed to the making of that brave, bold, creative hopeful life upon which the foundations of the Hebrew University are to be established. A university is the flowering of a life. A university is the flowering of a culture. It is the treasure house of the wealth of a nation. It is the preserver and the interpreter of national ideals.

Gathering about Mount Scopus, crowded into the open arena, thousands of Jews, inspirers of the renaissance, will witness the ceremony of dedication. And the doors of the white building, that rears its head majestically into the heavens, will open wide. They will come from all parts of the world—the scattered tribes, forgathered on the Judæan hills, joining in the hymn of praise. Scholars, poets, educators, men of professions, philanthropists, leaders of communities, the men of toil, will unite in a Passover pilgrimage for the dedication of this imposing edifice.

In the foreground, clasping hands with the Zionist leaders, will stand the distinguished representative of the greatest liberal civilization of our day. The Earl of Balfour, burdened with years, wise, forbearing, tenaciously loyal to his fondest aspiration, directs his faltering steps to Mount Scopus, eager to join a jubilant people in the resumption of the buoyant tasks of their civilization. He will bring a message of good-will, not only on behalf of the people for

whom he directly speaks, but also for the liberal brotherhood of intellect and ideals of which he is the superlative exponent. His word will be the first and it will be heard all over the world. The air will carry it into distant parts, and it will penetrate into circles that have not yet heard of the rebirth of a great old nation. It will speak to the heart and mind of Christendom. It will dispel hesitation in extending congratulations. It will develop appreciation of our race and aid greatly in establishing universal approval. The leading institutions of learning of America and Europe will be present either through persons delegated to represent them or through messages of greeting that will be read. Governments will send special envoys to register their presence, thus raising the event to the height of an international incident of the highest importance. There will be music and dramatic representations. Pomp and ceremony will attend the exercises.

These will be the visible actors, and this the visible and audible program. But we imagine the dead awakening, an invisible chorus joining in the songs of praise with toneless lips, hovering about Mount Scopus. Those who suffered for the ideal and endured the pangs of physical and mental anguish, those who died in order that their people might live in some far distant day, will be present, pale shadows glowing with a renewed fire.

The Zealots who fell in the defence of Jerusalem will rise. They have been passively waiting for hundreds of years. In their graves they endured the sufferings of their people. The martyrdom of the Jews was their martyrdom. Once and again, their dust was stirred by a new breeze, the dry bones seemed about to begin to stir; but the Day was still in the womb of Time. When the Return began, a quiver of unrest thrilled them, and now, when they see their descendants gathering to rebuild the ancient highways and reclothe the bare hills of Judæa, when Jerusalem is being redeemed, they rise from their cerements and partake of the joy that extends from Dan to Beersheba. Now

they know that they did not die in vain. When they finished and fell (across the chasm of hundreds of years), others arose, blood of their blood, flesh of their flesh, to weave the stronger bonds of an unbreakable national life.

The generations that kept the faith and retained the inner fire of Jewish devotion and passion—hiding their light so that none could see and, unseeing, could not destroy—that never saw the Promised Land, but died and were buried in alien soil, will forget humiliation and suffering; and their spirits, rising, passing through all the lands of persecution, will make their way back again to the land of their origin. And as the *shofar* is heard on Mount Scopus, they will join in the psalms of praise and jubilation that will resound throughout the Holy Land. They, too, will rise—the generations who died in the *Galuth*.

The invisible witnesses of the Rededication!

There is singing again on Mount Scopus. And there is rejoicing in the Holy City of Jerusalem.

MORDECAI MENAHEM KAPLAN

Dr. Kaplan (b. 1881 in Lithuania), educated in America and professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America since 1910, is one of the very few eminent thinkers that belong of right to American Jewry. He has summed up the thinking, study, and active experience of many years in *Judaism as a Civilization* (1934), a survey of Jewish and specifically Jewish-American life with a plan for its reconstruction, which undoubtedly sets a new standard in respect of both elaborateness and depth in American Jewish social philosophy. Dr. Kaplan's central and guiding notions may be briefly suggested by two sentences from his book. (1) "Judaism functions only so long as it is coextensive with the whole of the Jew's life." (2) "Judaism is unlikely to survive, as either an ancillary or as a coördinate civilization, unless it thrive as a primary civilization in Palestine." These two sentences contain, properly understood, the whole root of the matter. Especially telling and final are those critical portions of Dr. Kaplan's work in which he demonstrates the necessary inadequacy and perishableness of all forms of Jewish life which are not based on the concept of a people and its culture and the necessary reintegration of the individual Jew with his people and its culture both in exile and in Palestine. If Dr. Kaplan's teaching fails to influence the Jewish masses directly and will have to be transmitted to them by other minds and other voices, it will be not by reason of the inadequacy of his thought, but by his comparative failure to draw power from those primordial emotional and metaphysical forces which, broadly religious in their nature, are now, as they have always been, the necessary origins of human change and action.

MORDECAI MENAHEM KAPLAN

Judaism as a Civilization

It is a dangerous illusion to consider the crisis at present confronting Judaism as no different from or no more serious than the habitually recurrent crises that have threatened Jewish life throughout history. "This malady of Jewish life," say the easily optimistic and the complacent, "is an old disease; we have been sick before and we have become well again. We have faced all this in the past, and we have survived. Why alarm ourselves with gloomy forebodings? Why cudgel our brains for new-fangled remedies?" This diagnosis of our present malady is superficial, faulty, and mischievous. For the present situation of Jewry is unique as well as serious; its ills are deep-rooted and severe; and nothing less than the most radical, thorough-going change of regimen will restore it to health.

To be sure, no one would deny that there are many old, familiar elements in our new predicament. All the weaknesses of our ancestors—spiritual insensibility, ignorance, selfishness, superstition—we still possess without abatement. Much of our demoralization we recognize as due to the migrations of vast numbers; this surely is no new story for the Jew. Nor is the challenge to Jewish tradition new, and the undermining of authority. What is different is the presence of all these factors at once; what is unprecedented is the appearance, in addition to these, of a combination of two new powerful forces, either of which by itself is so disintegrating to Jewish life as to tax all our ingenuity and resourcefulness.

One new force is the integration of the Jew into the civic, political, and economic life of the country of which he is a citizen; the other is the challenge of modern ideology to Jewish tradition. Of these forces the first presents by far the greater menace to the continuance of the Jewish life. Not, one hastens to say, from the theoretic aspect of a possible conflict of loyalties between the Jew's duty to the country in which he lives and his duty to the Jewish people scattered through the world. The really serious consequence of the integration of the Jew with the general life about him is the crowding out of all social and cultural interests which are Jewish by the social and cultural interests which he must cultivate in common with the other citizens of his country. Jewish life needs the expenditure of a good deal of time, energy and resources; when these are drained away as completely as they are by the general life, Judaism faces the unprecedented danger of being completely submerged. Add now to this the fact that, when by some chance a certain reserve of time and energy and resources is still left for the cultivation of his Jewish heritage, the Jew discovers that heritage challenged by the whole trend of modern ideology, and one begins to appreciate the complicated problem of Judaism in the modern world.

In view of this situation, it is altogether beside the mark to engage in jeremiads about the present tendency to escape Judaism. Condemning those who find loyalty to Judaism a burden, and bewailing the spirit of the age which has brought about the deterioration in the stamina of the Jew, will get us nowhere. By appealing to the courage and self-respect of the Jew, we might for a time evoke from him a certain degree of self-sacrifice; but these are only temporary stimulants. What is required is nothing less than the most thorough overhauling of Jewish ideas and Jewish life. Nothing less than a complete reconstruction of belief and behaviour—a new conception of Judaism and a new regimen of Jewish daily living—can restore the col-

lective Jewish life to the strength and the stability it must have if it is to survive the challenge of the modern environment.

Certainly none of the conventional conceptions of Judaism is adequate to provide the needed *raison d'être* for Jewish life, or likely to prove effective to direct its activities or insure its continuance. The traditional concepts upon which Jewish life was based in the past—the election of Israel and the supernatural origin of the Torah—have long ceased to be potent. And the newer concepts which Reform evolved as a substitute—the uniqueness of the Jewish race and of the Jewish religion—have proved no more helpful to correspond with fact as is their irrelevance to present-day needs. Granted that the Jews are an exceptional race, what light does that throw on whether they should assimilate or not? Granted that Judaism is a unique religion, how does that demand the continued existence of the Jewish people? We need deeper values, a broader conception.

The fact is that these quite limited concepts arose not so much from a desire to understand Jewish needs as from a desire to enable our neighbours to place us in some category familiar to them. This motive actuated Josephus when, realizing how puzzled the Romans were over the Jews' resistance to emperor worship and their stubborn adherence to their national customs, he felt constrained to characterize them as a philosophic sect. But what may help our neighbours to identify us may not help us to meet our own problems. Certainly Josephus' definition would have little availed Ben-Zakkai when he was confronted with the problem of how to prevent the disintegration of the Jewish people after the loss of their Temple and state. His effort to reorganize the spiritual life of the Jews was guided by a much wider conception—the idea of Israel as a people appointed by God to usher in the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

Likewise, in our own day, to be classified as a race or religion may help to dispel the fears and suspicions which nations habitually entertain concerning any group which they are unable to place in a familiar category. But as for helping us in ordering our lives, these concepts are impotent. No less a protagonist of Judaism as a religion than Claude Montefiore seems lately to have come to recognize this fact, when in a recent address he felt impelled to reckon with the new, wider conception of "Jewishness." The word "Jewishness," he said, was not known in his younger days, but it has gained popularity and "it looks as if it has come to stay, at all events for a time." He struggles hard to define or describe the term. He realizes this Jewishness includes something which is not purely and solely religious. The farthest he gets in defining it is that it denotes a corporate plus—it is a historic plus, a tradition plus, a memory plus—and this plus we desire to retain and incorporate into our Jewishness. Later, he analyzes Jewishness into three elements—faith, historic consciousness, and fellowship consciousness. Are not these the mental struggles of a man who has the greater part of his life been seeking to make Judaism coterminus with religion, evidence that this conception has lost its vitality?

Fortunately, a finer, more fruitful conception of Jewish life has been crystallizing in the last fifty years, a conception amply adequate for achieving a sound equilibrium between the collective life of the Jew and the demands of his modern environment. It is the conception of Judaism as a civilization. Judaism is viewed as nothing less than the *tout ensemble* of all the elements that enter in what is usually termed the cultural life of a people, such as language, folkways, patterns of social organization, social habits and standards, spiritual ideals, which give individuality to a people and differentiate it from other peoples. According to this conception, Judaism is the funded cultural activity which the Jewish people has transmitted from

generation to generation. It is the living, dynamic process of intellectual, social, and spiritual give-and-take of Jews in the course of their relationship to one another as individuals and as members of various groups.

In a word, a civilization.

What are the practical implications of this conception? These: A civilization must be lived, not by a purposive group held together by voluntary association, but by a living and continuing people. If it is to endure as the product of common social interest, it can flourish only among those who live in physical propinquity. A civilization cannot arise out of social coöperation which is based merely upon some temporary aim. Only actual living together, working together, and being animated by the same group ideals can keep a civilization alive. Its vehicle must be a particular language which serves as a medium for writings that incorporate group memories and aspirations. Its content must consist of law codes, mores, expectations, and sanctions that are calculated to produce a sense of continuity in successive generations, and a sense of unity among the contemporaries of each generation. It has to be transmitted from generation to generation by the method of education, suggestion, imitation, public opinion, and authority.

But Jewish civilization has not merely to be transmitted; as new needs arise it has to be transformed. That is, it must do more than preserve the glories of the past; it must evolve to meet the challenge of the future. If the Jewish consciousness is to survive, it must be a continually re-adjusted, revitalized consciousness. If Jewish civilization is to have a future, it must become a modern civilization.

The continuance of Judaism as a living civilization is thus a twofold process: of preservation and re-creation. The problem of those concerned with its continuance is how to intelligently guide and direct this evolving new-old civilization.

In this enterprise it is of crucial importance that we keep in mind from the beginning that the various elements in a civilization—language, law, literature, social organization, religion—are related to each other organically, so that the functioning of each is bound up with and conditioned by every other. It is this organic union of the various elements in Judaism that makes it a civilization; so that if we plan to continue Judaism as a civilization we cannot plan to preserve any of these elements without the other.

In essays in *The Menorah Journal*—especially “Toward a Reconstruction of Judaism” in the April, 1927, issue—and elsewhere, the writer has made an effort to consider in some detail these various elements, what the traditional function and strength of each has been and how specifically each might be changed to meet the new demands of our day. With regard to organization he has sketched the rôle which the two most potent traditional social institutions might play in our day—the Synagogue and the Kehillah. In the field of law he has tried to outline the steps Jewish law should take towards establishing a new kind of authority and how this authority might function in the three diverse milieus in which the Jew finds himself—Eastern Europe, Western Europe and America, and Palestine. As for language, the importance of Hebrew as the national tongue has been pointed out, the necessity of Hebrew education urged, and its character defined. He has also discussed the integral part that the creative arts must assume in Jewish life, if Judaism is to be a modern civilization; how literature, music, drama, painting, sculpture, and architecture may be made to contribute to our spiritual enrichment; how Jewish talents must be fostered and utilized. Finally, he has considered religion, recognizing its place in the *tout ensemble* of Jewish culture as primal and central, but suggesting that its character can no longer be of the thaumaturgic type or credal type which flourished in the past, but of the humanistic type which is based upon vital present-day needs, both personal and social.

It is curious—considering that the writer and others of the group now urging the concept of Judaism as a civilization have been continually emphasizing the paramount importance of religion in their vision of the complete Jewish life¹—that the chief criticism with which they have to cope is the accusation that they wish to secularize Jewish life, that they take an attitude to religion entirely neutral if not negative. Why has this fallacious notion arisen, and what has given it such great currency? Partly, no doubt, because the proponents of the conception of Judaism as a civilization have been urging the importance of many secular interests which traditionally, though not in their scheme, have often been non-religious, sometimes anti-religious. They have pointed out the need of organization, and organization as such is not religious. They have emphasized the reclamation of Palestine; Zionism has often gone hand in hand with antagonism toward religion. Similarly, since Hebrew, literature, and the fine arts may be and often are cultivated in a spirit that is completely secular, it is not difficult to see that those interested in fostering them might be accused of giving aid and comfort to Jewish “secularists.” Perhaps, too, the comparatively large space which the advocates of the new conception have given to the discussion of the place of Jewish secular concerns in their program has given impetus to the misunderstanding. But they have done so not because they thought them more important, but because they felt them more ignored. The prevailing conception was that Judaism included religion and nothing else. Their conception was that Judaism was religion *plus*. What more natural than that they should turn most of their attention to establishing what the *plus* was—what besides religion there was in the content of Jewish civilization?

This *plus*, around which disagreement has centred, con-

¹ E.g., “The one cultural element in the Jewish civilization which will have to constitute the object of outstanding interest in the future, as in the past, is religion.”—*Toward a Reconstruction of Judaism*.

sists of the secular, national element in Jewish life; and the vigorous advocacy required to win for them their right to be included in modern Judaism may easily have given the program of the new group a secular sound.

To deduce, however, from this that the new conception was non-religious was, of course, completely unwarranted. Nevertheless, the fact that this criticism exists and is so widespread indicates, perhaps, that we have not made sufficiently clear what the function of religion is in this new conception of Judaism as a civilization. What follows, therefore, is meant to suggest what our view is of the function of religion in Jewish life, and what direction its evolution must take if it is to meet the spiritual needs of modern Jewry.

The conception of Judaism as a civilization, far from implying that as a civilization Judaism can dispense with religion, assures religion the primary function in Jewish life. For on one point the history and logic of all civilizations are clear: in a civilization religion is the most vitalizing and the most integrating force.

More than that, the conception of Judaism as a civilization gives a sounder, more substantial *raison d'être* for the continuance of the Jew's adherence to his faith. The modern Jew everywhere is asking, "Why should I profess the Jewish religion?" Compare what the older conceptions, Orthodoxy and Reform, have to tell him with the answer of the new conception, and it is clear which is likely to make the stronger, more convincing appeal to men of our day.

Orthodoxy, assuming religion to be a way of life which makes for salvation or self-fulfilment, maintains that the only way of life which can make for such salvation or self-fulfilment is one supernaturally revealed. Judaism, as *the* supernaturally revealed way of life, is, therefore, the only true religion. According to Reform Judaism, the knowledge of the way of life that makes for salvation is derived not from any supernatural source but is the outcome of

human experience. Now human experience, the Reformist continues, has evolved many religions, each more or less effective as a means of attaining salvation, how effective depending upon the religious talent of the peoples that have evolved them. Since the way of life evolved by the Jewish people has been more generally reckoned with than that of any other individual or people, the Reformists conclude that the Jews possess a veritable genius for religion. The way of life which they have achieved they therefore declared to be the best religion—that is, the most potent means of attaining salvation. This theory exposes Jewish religion to the challenge of doubts and questionings which characterize modern thought, to say nothing of the comparison to which it must be ready to subject itself with other claimants to salvation. Moreover, what remains of the Jewish religion, after having met the challenge successfully, is bound to prove of so universal a character as to recommend it to all seekers after truth and to leave no reason why it should be designated as Jewish. This conclusion is confirmed by the actual state of affairs in Reform Judaism. From the standpoint of religion as such, there is certainly much more in common between liberal Christians and liberal Jews than there is between liberal Jews and orthodox Jews.

From the standpoint, however, of Judaism as a civilization, the acceptance of Jewish religion does not have to wait upon the successful issue of comparison with other religions, but will result from the will to live as Jews, provided we have a correct understanding of the relation of religion to a civilization and of the form and character religion will take in a modern civilization. Such an understanding will of itself constitute a bulwark against the anti-religious and secular tendencies of the day.

As a prerequisite to a correct understanding of the place of religion in human life, the writer suggests the need of differentiating between folk religion and personal religion. A great deal of the tangle which exists in the minds not

only of the laity, but even of scholars, would be unravelled if we were to introduce these categories into our thinking about religion. Folk religion may be defined as that system of values and practices through which the individual identifies himself with the people or community which he considers indispensable to his self-fulfilment or salvation. Personal religion, on the other hand, is that world outlook and the conduct resulting from it which are a personal achievement and which enable the individual to find himself at home in the world. Folk religion, as the term indicates, is primarily a community affair. Its function, not always necessarily professed, is to foster social unity and responsibility. The characteristic of a folk religion is that its acceptance is compulsory, not a matter of choice, and departure from it is regarded as treason. Personal religion is, to use an expression of Whitehead's, "what the individual does with his solitariness." It is not transmitted from the parent to the child, but from teacher to disciple, and is altogether a matter of the individual will and choice. Both kinds of religion have the self-fulfilment of the individual as their end; they differ only in the means they offer to that self-fulfilment. In folk religion, living in, through, and for the community is deemed the most effective means of self-fulfilment. In personal religion, the individual reserves the right to determine what shall be the means of self-fulfilment.

All primitive religions, it is clear, were necessarily folk religions. We have learned from anthropology that totems, ancestors, and gods were the concrete representations by means of which early man became intuitively aware of the collective power for good or for evil that resided in his clan or tribe. But that the historical religions, like those of Jewry, Christendom, and the Mohammedan peoples, are also folk religions is generally overlooked. Christian apologists charge Judaism with being an ethnic religion in contrast with Christianity, which they claim has set its heart upon the salvation of the individual soul. This claim

is contradicted by the entire history of Christianity, which is the history of a Church and not of a religious philosophy. If Judaism is an ethnic religion (which may be granted), Christianity is an imperial religion. A religion that makes salvation contingent upon loyalty to a nation or to an amalgam of nations, to a tribe or to an empire, is a folk religion. In the very insistence upon loyalty, whether it be loyalty to tradition, to dogma, or to constituted authority, at the sacrifice of individual judgment and preference, it is the collective will that functions. Hence any religion in which there figures the appeal to loyalty is a collective or folk religion.

This view of the historical religions does not deny the element of personal choice and self-dedication which enters into the religion of the devout followers of the different faiths, but we must not confuse such an individuated expression of folk religion with that religion which is achieved by the individual apart from, or even in despite of, his particular folk. Incidentally, with this distinction in mind, we shall henceforth understand the difference between theology and religious philosophy. Theology is the systematic presentation of the beliefs and sanctions which constitute the cognitive element of folk religion. Religious philosophy, on the other hand, is a philosophy of life in which the conception of God is based upon personal experience and reasoning.

In the eighteenth century, the number and influence of those who rejected the folk religion of their time and formulated their own personal religion grew to such an extent that they were able to inaugurate a movement to separate Church from State. To this day very few thinkers have taken the trouble to puzzle out just what is implied in this act of separation. It must become apparent that in reality this separation has not meant a division of functions between two coördinate institutions, but a gradual transfer to the State of those prerogatives and functions which were formerly the monopoly of the Church. The

Church is in actuality subordinate to the State, the degree of subordination varying from the exercise of its influence over State affairs covertly, to being persecuted overtly. As time goes on the influence of the Church is bound to wane. "The two Catholic religions of civilization are Christianity and Buddhism, and—if we are to judge by the comparison of their position now with what it has been—both of them are in decay," says Whitehead.

Assuming that the churches will dwindle and finally disappear altogether, will there survive then only personal religion? This opinion, commonly held by all those who consider the end of organized religion to be in sight, is altogether untenable. It would be far more logical to maintain that all religion would disappear, both folk and personal, than to promise a future to personal religion while pronouncing the doom of folk religion. For if we accept as the essential trait of religion the self-fulfilment of the individual, then we must realize that the very consciousness of such an aim is unthinkable without folk religion. Whatever personal religion may add in the way of criticizing the means to self-fulfilment, the individual is dependent upon the community for conceiving the very need for self-fulfilment. Instead of prophesying the disappearance of folk religion, it would be more in keeping with the trend of human life to assume that folk religions will survive, though in a radically altered form.

Folk religion, we believe, will, as heretofore, continue to function as a means of integrating the individual into his community, but will no longer be of a thaumaturgic character. It will not assert any preternatural claims for the community, as being specially favoured by God or as being worthier than any other community, or as constituting the whole or even the best part of the world in which the individual dare move and have his being. Folk religion will confine itself to the modest demand that the individual appreciate the fact that the foundations of his humanity and character are supplied him not by the world

at large with its multitude of cultures, but by that section of mankind which constitutes the particular folk to which he belongs. The individual human being comes into possession of the human heritage not through universal concepts and loyalties, but through the specific tradition or social inheritance of the community of which he is a part. Thus the individual is prepared for world citizenship by first having inculcated in him national citizenship.

The community being indispensable to the rearing of the individual, it has a right in return to expect of the individual, after he has matured, that degree of adherence and loyalty which will enable it to perpetuate its life through him. This expectation will be recognized and lived up to by those normally constituted human beings who are destined to keep the human race alive. Insofar as that expectation will be met, we shall have folk religion. We shall have all those institutions in the life of the people that will bear the earmarks of religion as it has historically functioned. There will be rituals, festivals, communal gatherings and symbols, the glorification of heroes and martyrs. There will be the affirmation of ideals, the willingness to render sacrifice, and the sense of exaltation, all of which have formed an integral part of the historical religions.

These manifestations of national life are not a thing of the future. They exist now, but we are so familiar with them as to have missed their true import. We think of them as expressions of patriotism, and never does it occur to us that they are folk religions in the true sense of the term, gradually displacing the folk religions of the churches. Thus it is that when we shall come to understand fully the nature of the changes going on at the present time in the spiritual life of mankind, we shall see that the civilization of a people must of necessity find expression in folk religion, in addition to the other outlets for its functioning. For it is only in the folk religion that a civilization reaches

the point of self-consciousness which is essential to its perpetuation.

If, then, we are to accept Jewish civilization as best calculated to evoke our individual potentialities, and as capable of enriching the world of values, we cannot conceive it as devoid of folk religion. The task which therefore confronts those of us who wish to see Judaism continue as a modern civilization is, first, to reinterpret and reconstruct the traditional beliefs and practices which formerly emphasized the religious aspect of Jewish life, so that instead of being part of a thaumaturgic scheme of salvation, as they were regarded hitherto, they shall constitute the kind of modern folk religion which, though it may have a justifiable claim upon the loyalty of the individual Jew, does not presume to monopolize him. Second, we should lay down plans and formulate criteria for the future course and enrichment of the Jewish folk religion. Third, our endeavour should be to stimulate and use the energies of personal religion.

It must be borne in mind that this entire discussion is from the standpoint of the modernist Jew. The Orthodox Jew has, theoretically speaking, no problem. He is not interested in making provision for enabling those who do not subscribe to the traditional view of religion, as divinely revealed truth and guidance, to find a place in Jewish life; it is against his very principle to do so. Thus the burden of adjustment rests entirely on the modernist. He has to formulate a program whereby he will be able to be true to his convictions and yet experience a sense of unity not merely with Jews who think as he does, but with both the Jews of the past and with all those present-day Jews to whose fundamentalist views he cannot subscribe. He can afford to ignore the derogatory attitude with which the Orthodox are bound to view his efforts at readjustment, and even their denial of his right to call himself a Jew. But in his own heart he must be satisfied that the method which he proposes for himself will lead to a mode

of life which any impartial observer will recognize as having continuity with the Judaism of history.

If this be the object in view with which the Jewish modernist must approach the entire complex of traditional beliefs and practices, he is bound to adopt as his principle the conservation of form and the reconstruction of meaning.

To discuss the practices first, it is clear that conservation of form with reconstruction of meaning has been the history of the Jewish civilization. The external forms in which the God-idea found expression, the means of worship of the various *mizwot*, have undergone relatively little change. But the meaning of each of these items has little in common with their original meanings. This process of change, carried on in the past unconsciously, must at present be undertaken consciously and deliberately. To be sure, there is an element of artificiality in so deliberate a change, and if this process were the sum total of Judaism's readjustment, the task would soon become repellent. But there is so much that is new and of a positively constructive nature in the task, that it will offset the sense of artificiality which, in any case, would be experienced only in the beginning of the readjustment. After a while this method will become a habit and seem perfectly natural.

Since identity of form is essential as an element of unity, as many of the traditional *mizwot* as possible should be continued. The Sabbath, the festivals, the dietary laws, circumcision, the ceremonies in the home and the synagogue, and the ceremonies associated with the significant occasions in the life of the individual should all continue to be enacted in the life of the Jew. But it is evident that we cannot expect the form to be uninfluenced by the reconstruction in meaning. Since these practices are no longer to be treated as divinely ordained institutions, as *mizwot* in the traditional sense, though they may still be designated *mizwot* in a poetic or mystically religious sense, they will take on the character of folkways, and will be

treated with considerable latitude and spontaneity. The phase of legalistic casuistry will disappear.

A more difficult task will be to retain the texts and thought-content and at the same time reconstruct their meaning. The sacred writings and the religious formulas are at the present time essential as a means of unity and continuity. It will require considerable flexibility of mind to treat them as forms the meaning of which is to be reconstructed. Yet it can be done provided there be developed a pragmatic method of interpretation. By this is meant that we habituate ourselves to view a statement not in terms of the literal meaning of its words, but in terms of the series of thoughts, attitudes, and actions to which it gave rise. These inner and outer consequences actually constitute the real meaning of any text or formula. To retrieve them, to choose from among them those that are socially and spiritually worth while, should be the task of a modernist *midrash*.

The one element in traditional Jewish religion which at first sight seems incapable of being continued and re-adapted as part of folk religion is worship. To the modern ear, there is something incongruous in treating worship as an integral element of civilization. Yet an objective study of the psychological and social factors involved in the relation of public worship to the cultural life of a group indicates that the various civilizations of the future will find expression in public worship, as did all civilizations of the past. There is, to be sure, a marked tendency at the present time to treat all religious ceremonialism, and especially prayer, as a purely private affair, meant for those of a sentimental or superstitious turn of mind. This tendency, however, is merely a passing phase and should not be taken too seriously. Viewed psychologically, worship seems too deeply rooted in the nature of the human being to be capable of being permanently dispensed with. So long as a people will have its holidays and festivals to commemorate the events in its career, to recall its victories and to

confirm it in its strivings, the institution of public worship is likely to survive. For public worship is a means of giving a people that collective consciousness which unifies its life and integrates all of its individuals into a spiritual totality. We may rest assured that before long it will be reinstated in all normally functioning civilizations, though undoubtedly in a much changed form.

In fine, as little as we can conceive a civilization without literature, music, and architecture, so little should it be possible to conceive a civilization without public worship. But there is no gainsaying the fact that the revolution which has taken place in human outlook upon life is bound to revolutionize our ideas as to the purpose and method of worship. This revolution implies both the negation of many a traditional belief concerning the nature and effectiveness of worship, and the emergence of new constructive ideas concerning worship. So far, the change has expressed itself merely in negation. When we hear people saying that they can find in the drama and in music and in the reading of a book what people formerly expected to find in worship, they labour under the misconception that there is but one philosophy and method of worship, and that the traditional one. They have not as yet learned that, even with our new world outlook, worship has still its own function to serve, which cannot be replaced by any type of mere intellectual or æsthetic activity.

In the future, worship will not be regarded as having for its object the fulfilment of the private wishes of the individual worshippers. The magic influence of praise-offerings addressed to God is precluded by modern conceptions of God. Likewise, the authoritarian aspect of ceremonialism—the belief that, in order to be effective, worship must take on the form laid down by tradition and that the least departure from it is heresy and rebellion—is no longer tenable. To be sure, a certain element of uniformity is rendered indispensable by the very purpose which worship is intended to serve. But to raise that uni-

formity to the level of a soul-saving quality does not go well with the urge for spontaneous self-expression. Least of all should stereotyped liturgical formulas, which have ceased to call forth any emotional response or a definite comprehensible idea, be permitted to usurp the place that ought to be taken by ever new formulation of our spiritual yearnings.

What are the positive aspects of worship which should recommend it to the most advanced and progressive? To make the most out of our lives, to attain the highest degree of self-realization and self-fulfilment, two needs of our nature have to be met. One is the need for selecting and holding on to the facts and forces in the world that make for the worth-whileness of life; the other is the need to feel that all those with whom our life is identified are ready to coöperate with us in meeting that first need.

This twofold need is met only by worship. Worship is the affirmation of the meaning of life, of its moral and spiritual values; it is the declaration of allegiance to spiritual ideals. And it gives reality, purpose, and self-consciousness to the collective spirit of a people. Worship as affirmation of the meaning of life both continues and readapts the historic tendency manifest in all worship—namely, that of praising the Deity. In primitive and undeveloped minds there may have existed the notion that praises were a form of flattery which ought to be used to elicit favours from the Deity. When we become aware, however, how many spiritually-minded people in the world there have been and are, to whom the act of praising God constituted communion with God which they enjoyed for its own sake, we can easily fall into the habit of worship whenever we want to affirm the existence of forces in the world that make for life, goodness, and beauty.

The following are some of the principles which should, the writer suggests, be reckoned with in reinstating worship as part of Jewish folk religion: (1) It should intensify one's Jewish consciousness. There should be no mistake as

to the type of civilization and people with which Jewish public worship identifies the Jew. (2) It should express our relation to the world and to the life of the world from the standpoint of our present conception of nature. (3) It should voice the aspiration of Israel to serve the cause of humanity. (4) It should emphasize the high worth and potentialities of the individual soul.

To achieve these purposes, Jewish worship would have to conform to the following conditions: (1) The language and the atmosphere of the worship should be entirely Hebraic. The architecture of the building should in some way express traits of Jewish culture. The reading from the scroll, the use of the *talit*, the *shofar*, *lulab*, *kiddush*, *habdallah*, while they can no longer have the ritual significance that they had for our fathers, can help to give Jewish worship its distinctive character. The retention of the Hebrew would make possible far greater latitude and flexibility in the content, so that Jewish worship would not have to be confined to stereotyped formulas and antiquated ideas and could progress with the movement of mind and of the spirit without becoming any the less Jewish. Moreover, if the synagogue were to substitute the vernacular for the Hebrew, the Jews of one country could not unite in worship with the Jews of another. (2) Worship must be highly æsthetic. The synagogue, reckoning with the fact that it is mainly through the æsthetic appeal that worship succeeds in its purpose, should encourage whatever architectural, musical, or dramatic talent we possess to create forms embodying the ideas expressed in Jewish worship. (3) In content, the worship should deal not only with the past but also with the present interests of the Jews, both collective and individual. The renascence of the Jewish spirit and the reclamation of our ancient homeland should be given a foremost place in our present-day ritual. Likewise, the yearning for peace, for justice, and for freedom should be given more specific expression

than that which is implied in the various prayers for the establishment of the kingdom of God.

The task of modern Judaism must not end with the readjustment of its folk religion. There are two outstanding inadequacies in folk religion which only personal religion can make good. But, however high an ethical standard it may uphold for the members of the group in their relationships to one another, it is not likely to transcend the limitations of folk morality. Thus, emphasis on folk religion alone is likely to lead, when unsupplemented by personal religion, to a sort of consecrated chauvinism. Secondly, folk religion as such must henceforth be limited to a humanistic outlook. While such an outlook may be sufficient for a life of average excellence, it can by no means be expected to satisfy the growing number of those to whom humanism itself is in need of a sanction and justification in superhumanism. The human mind can rest only temporarily in a humanistic philosophy; after a while it resumes its endeavour to extend its horizon beyond the narrow span of earthly life and the limited area of visible and tangible realities.

Personal religion can thus become the most potent curative of the evils inherent in folk religion without destroying its inherent good. It can likewise become the most prolific source for supplying the insufficiencies of folk religion. Thus far no civilization has made any contribution to the problem of so balancing the functions of folk and of personal religion as to insure their reacting beneficially upon each other, each supplementing the other. Here is an opportunity for Jewish civilization to become creative once again in a phase of human life which it has enriched by its achievements in the past.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

This American novelist and (quite secondarily) critic is descended from German Jews assimilated for several generations. He was born in Berlin (1883) and brought to America in childhood. He has told the story of himself up to the age of 45 in the three more or less autobiographical volumes: *Up Stream, Israel, Mid-Channel*. Never except in his confused and misled twenties as alienated from his people as has often been assumed (and then with a recurrently evil conscience), he returned to the faith of his fathers and embraced the Zionist cause, in which he has been as active as life has permitted him to be, fully fifteen years ago. He has had the career of an active man of letters and has written many volumes of which (with the exception of two pieces of fiction, *The Case of Mr. Crump* and *The Golden Vase*, and of one treatise, *The Permanent Horizon*) he values only his Jewish works: *The Island Within* and more especially *The Last Days of Shylock* and *This People*. Upon this creative path and upon the path of Zionist activity he hopes to continue to the end.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

I *Disassociation*

THE Palestinian experience completed in me a process of imaginative disassociation. . . . The majority of Western Jews, surveying the historic places and memorials of their own and other countries, steeped in the literature of one or more European languages, have cultivated a sense of possession in this past, as though they, and their ancestors, too, had creatively possessed it. They have not only forgotten Jewish history; they have imaginatively and emotionally substituted Gentile history for their own. American Jews go as tourist pilgrims to England as though to find the roots and background of their own cultural life; they visit the cities of the Continent and see even in Cologne and Speyer, in Vienna and Venice, in Narbonne and Rome, only the splendid and heroic memories and monuments of the Germanic and Latin peoples who are native to the soil. And why should they not? they will ask. The question will be echoed by liberal Gentiles, while tense European nationalists will go farther and declare that only by thus identifying themselves inwardly with Western civilization are Jews tolerable as fellow-citizens at all. Well, the reasons why Jews should not do this thing are many and subtle and far-reaching and profound. There are first of all the subjective reasons. Whether our character has doomed us to our history or whether our history has shaped us into our present being, the fact of our peculiarity as a people remains. Now inner clarity and balance are perhaps the chief goods of life. And how is he

to attain that clarity and balance of which the fruits are wisdom and understanding, dignity and grace of life, whose whole inner existence is founded, consciously or not, on an unreality, a figment, an artifice; all of whose cultural processes are parasitic in their nature? The test of the exactness of this analysis can be made in many ways of which even the crudest will bring its truth overwhelmingly home. Take the sleekest and most completely Westernized of Jews assimilated in the third generation and tell him that his direct ancestor, five centuries ago, trudged the homeless roads of the world in search of a livelihood, was fervent in study and exercises of piety, and suffered death at the hands of the Inquisition on a false charge of proselytizing. That modern Jew's immediate reaction will be a melancholy but profound acquiescence. Tell him, on the other hand, that his ancestor was a knight in armour riding forth to war at the behest of his feudal chief, and our modern gentleman's equally immediate reaction will be an ironic and slightly ribald grin. No, not at all on account of the factual unlikelihood! To him, as to that remote ancestor of his, provision for wife and child and home and learning and knowledge and stoical endurance are serious and natural things, while chivalry, loyalty by convention and fighting, are to him simply stupid and dangerous. The content of the Jewish mind has changed, not that mind itself. Hence the voluntary rejection of Jewish memories and the substitution of Gentile memories and traditions produce disharmonies, suppressed conflicts, and ultimately a sickness of the soul. . . . Ah, they end badly, these Jews who have utterly suppressed their Jewishness. Volumes of tales could be written of them. They will be very rich and honoured, too, by the world. But an element of grotesqueness will cling to their Gentile correctness and there will be just grins and whispers behind their backs. Do they not feel those grins and whispers? They will be scholars and masters of speech and will bear beautiful Nordic names. But they know that the true name and true

inwardness of them are known, and in their most brilliant works and so, too, in their souls there will be an element of strain, of excess, almost of hysteria. They will be converted to Catholicism and enter monasteries and flee from the monasteries and alternate between asceticism and debauchery and find no peace. I could write each one of these tales here indicated and draw my subject from a living model. . . .¹

We wrong ourselves. We also wrong subtly but very definitely the objects of our assimilatory vision. We are like those inept theorists who, forgetting that art is expression, and that craftsmanship is a means toward an end—a fact long patent and now demonstrated by analytical psychology—declare the painters and sculptors of the Christian tradition to have been concerned solely with planes and colours and rhythm and problems of composition. We æstheticize unendurably and rob the objects we seem to embrace of their significance and power. To us, Chartres is at best a strangely noble piece of design. We may coldly apprehend but cannot feel its burning and special aspiration, its happy, devout polytheism, its weird and ghastly and ribald sculpturesque detail. These things are beyond the range of our inner experience. The cathedral does not speak to us. We are pretending to ourselves when we do not inwardly smile at the votive candles burning in equal number before a rosy-cheeked Virgin and an image of St. Anthony of Padua. We are in better case in respect of secular monuments, but the distinction is a specious one. Civilizations express in their totality an ethos which is definite, however hard to sum up in a formula, and strongly one despite the multiplicity of its expressions. And the ethos that from within outward built Christian civilization is not ours. Nor does it tend to become very much more our own. In the past we were excluded from direct coöperation, and in the assimilatory period we have more than ever excluded ourselves. For imitation changes

¹ Cf. Somerset Maugham's admirable tale, *The Alien Corn*.

to form and enlarges no boundaries. Only by being steadfast themselves and Judaizing the civilizations of their homelands in proportion to their numbers and ability will the Jews of the diaspora be able to exchange cultural parasitism for cultural creativeness. And the first step toward that end is the cleanness and clearness wrought within by the discipline of imaginative disassociation.

I would make this point very clear. It is assimilation that excludes us from the civilizations amid which our lot is cast. If you ape the Nordic unsuccessfully, your life and expression will be both distracted and shoddy. If your aping is successful you increase quantitatively, and never on a high plane, that which already exists. Felix Mendelssohn is but another and not indispensable German composer of the Romantic school. Powerful personalities, whatever their superficial theory or attitude, have never, luckily, been able to exclude the strong essential Jewishness from their lives and works, and it is this element that gives them both character and quality. It is by virtue of this element that they have stamped themselves upon Western civilization and wrought upon it creatively and so made it in a measure their own. The blank assimilationist is ape or parrot; he has a rich and fruitful relationship to nothing under the sun. He is sterile. He plays safe. In America he writes music like Mr. Irving Berlin's and stories like Mr. Octavus Roy Cohen's. He purveys the odious trade goods in the arts. The anti-Semites are quite right. Jews in all countries produce a great quantity of base stuff. They do so, however, not because they are Jews, but because they are desperately trying not to be Jews. They are trying to be imitations of their neighbours and the great and deep and noble things are not imitable from without.

.

On the way to Rome, opposite the dark hill and town of Orvieto, there stole into my mind a forgotten and now

suddenly recovered hour of long ago. I saw a bright Queens-haven college classroom; I saw the faces, blurred and a little featureless as in a dream, of my classmates, and heard across the years the high, slightly hoarse voice of our professor, "*Credat Judæus Apella!*" It was the skeptical and amiable Horace who, repudiating for himself some foolish superstition, exclaimed, "Let Apella, the Jew, believe that!" Evidently I—else why the vivid recovery of that lost hour—had winced inwardly there in that Queens-haven classroom at the age of sixteen and had then promptly expelled from my mind the brief whiplike phrase of the poet which alone might have shown me that the heritage of classical antiquity was, in a sense, not mine. Another was intimately mine. But what was it? Like all Jewish youngsters educated wholly in the traditions of the West, I had heard and knew little of that heritage of mine—mine apparently whether I wanted it or not—except in terms of contempt and contumely followed at last in the nineteenth century by such coldly practical pleas for tolerance as Macaulay's *Essay on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews*. Is that situation alone not enough to warp the psychical development and health of anyone? You are immersed in a given civilization and you must fear any voice from that civilization that concerns yourself, your fathers, your blood. Worst of all, you come to believe those voices. Who has not met Jews sincerely convinced that both Rome and Pauline Christianity were not only pragmatically but philosophically right, that the oral tradition, Talmudim and Midrashim, are a mass of superstitious rubbish, and that the thoughts and beliefs and customs of their ancestors could never have been saving ones? Their sincerity does not ease such people nor does their rigorous expulsion of all things Jewish from their consciousness touch the causes of their disease. Man is so made that he cannot with impunity negate himself, his blood, his instincts, and his heritage. The first necessity, then, is that disassociation of which I have spoken, the imaginative

separation of our own history—for better or worse—from the general history of the nations.

"Credat Judæus Apella!" Horace writing this phrase in about the year 35 B.C. had no fear of being misunderstood. The Jews in Rome, already dwelling on the site of the later Ghetto between the slope of the Capitoline Hill and the bank of the Tiber, were currently known among cultivated Romans as a fierce, weird, and ignorantly superstitious Oriental folk. For they alone of all the nations that Rome had conquered refused their assent to the symbols of Rome's power. They would pour no libation to the Capitoline Jove nor honour the statue of a deified emperor; their sullen resistance and their austere separateness from pagan civilization seemed to exclude them from the universal community of mankind. Neither simple citizens of the Empire nor the cultivated courtiers of Augustus could make anything of a people, the Holy of Holies of whose Temple was "a vacant dwelling-place and empty shrine with no image of any god," and concerning whom, therefore, arose the strange counter-superstition that they worshipped nothing but the clouds and the sky itself. From such causes sprang the fierce impatience of Tacitus, the fiercer slander of Juvenal and many centuries later the ironic contempt of Gibbon.

Yes, anti-Semitism is older than Christianity and may easily survive it. How futile for the extreme rationalist, often an assimilated Jew, to deny the uniqueness of our character and experience or else to refuse it, when he is constrained to admit the facts, a meaning and a function. It is true enough that any attempt strictly to define this meaning and this function leads us into difficulties. Historic processes elude the grasp of logical definition. But this meaning and this function can be experienced without being formulated; they can be lived without being defined; they can be felt and expressed while we wait for more knowledge. . . .

I felt them in Rome. Here, written in stone and recorded in marble, is the long history of that Western World which has made us in each stage and during every phase, in splendour or decay, the objects of its fear or of its hate. Yet we had never any power wherewith to make ourselves feared and hated except the power of the spirit, and the only tangible monument of our millennial existence in all this city of memories and monuments is that relief under the arch of Titus delineating the destruction of our Temple and our capital. Pagan Rome hated us because we would not bow down to its eagles and fasces and statues; Christian Rome hated and feared us because we would not follow the morbid Hellenizing of Paul of Tarsus nor endure the paganization of the religion we had unwittingly brought forth; now that the high wave of Christianity recedes, men are inventing new myths, whether of race or of conspiracy, wherewith to justify their hate anew. . . . It is well for a Jew to go to Rome and on the Forum and again on the Pincian Hill or on the Vatican to survey in imagination that pageant of history of which the memorials are all about him. Palaces have been built and have been ruined; a thousand triumphs have ended in a page of history and a little dust; a million men have died for the vain symbols of some transitory power.

O miseras hominum mentis, O pectora caeca!

A high and sad compassion for all mankind steals into the heart of the Jew. His people could not build palaces nor grasp after power nor, by enslaving others, enslave themselves. They could not triumph over their fellow-men; they could only endure. And so time, cruel destroyer of all others, has relented to them, has let them be and continue almost as changeless in their kind and character as are the olives and the pines and cypresses upon the Pincian Hill. Building no monuments, they have remained; struggling with none, they have prevailed; opposing the spirit to the world, they are still here. . . .

II

Ways of Life

Religions are ways of life; every prophet says implicitly or explicitly: I am the way . . . the way to salvation, to reconciliation with one's soul, one's fellow-men, with pain and death and the inscrutable universe. There are three ways of life in the Western world—the pagan, the Christian, the Jewish.

The pagan accepts man and the universe as given. He accepts nature as implacable and fortune as mad and blind and brutal. Cicero, seeking in Euripides a passage of universal truth and weightiness to turn into Latin verse, selects: "There is no mortal whom pain does not touch or many ills . . . earth must return to earth and life is to be feared by all; we are as the fruits of the field. Thus necessity decrees." *Sic jubet necessitas*. Such is the central reaction of an enlightened paganism from Euripides to Bertrand Russell's essay, *A Free Man's Worship*. Accepting man and nature as they are, the two aims of paganism were and are to understand the nature of things as far as the mind of man will reach and thus to subdue fear. Hence the Greeks laid the foundations of every science and the sombre rapture of Lucretius celebrates the conquest over superstition. To curb desire not because it is evil, but because it brings pain, to confront age and death and the malevolence of nature with calm, with dignity, with serenity—such are the high achievements of a pagan ethos. For human warmth there was love of country—the extension of the affection for hearth and home to tribe and land. Vergil's

Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas

is the one great pagan note: "Happy is the man who can attain knowledge of the causes of things and can thus trample underfoot all fears and fate the inexorable and

the tumult of greedy Acheron." And the other note is sounded in his lovely invocation to Italy:

*Salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
magna virum.*

And there is in this way and view of life necessarily a third note, the note popularly supposed to be most characteristic of paganism, and that is the Horatian "refrain from asking what tomorrow will bring forth and count as gain whatever days Chance gives you and do not spurn, O youth, either delightful loves or choral dances while yet morose old age is far from your fresh blooming." And doubtless the pagan way of life must dwell on that note among ordinary mortals who are sustained neither by the ardour of the search for truth nor by that hope of literary glory which one finds expressed by almost all the major ancients:

*Ingenio mors nulla nocet, vacat undique tutum:
inlaesum semper carmina nomen habent.*

I shall not dwell on the commonplaces of every Christian historian and pulpit. But it is true that paganism omitted almost wholly both the fact and the problem of human suffering. It accepted pain as incurable and bade man make the best of it. Hence the triumph of Paul and of the Christian way of life. For the pagan acceptance of man and nature it substituted a complete repudiation, for truth vision and for reason faith. It is needless to rehearse here the great and terrible seventh chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians or the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. Doom was at hand. The fashion of this world passeth away. What mattered nature which was about to be shrivelled up like a scroll or man who was an immediate candidate for either heaven or hell? What need was there except to crucify the body of this death? . . . A perfect way of life, perhaps, under the shadow of a last day. Remain as you are, married or unmarried, slave or free. Watch

and pray. But the fashion of this world remained. And the Christian repudiation of nature and reason remained too. Hence sprang the incurable antinomy and dualism at the heart of Christianity and the failure of Christianity to humanize life. For force and war and empire and injustice and the pagan cult of glory and all the actions and passions of the natural man continued, and Christianity declaring all these purely evil and wholly damned had no power upon them. It lost the world by repudiating the world. It had to endure the repaganization of all mortal things by despising them. "That is the highest wisdom," exclaims the author of the *Imitation of Christ*, "to approach the heavenly realms by a contempt of the world!" And again: "Consider yourself, as it were, a wanderer and an exile upon earth." That is the Christian note, that and the rapturous "*Ecce sto ante te pauper et nudus, gratiam postulans et misericordiam implorans!*" And above all those final injunctions of the *Imitation*, "The human reason is feeble and can fall into error; true faith cannot fall into error. All reason and all natural investigation must follow faith and must neither precede it nor infringe upon it." Christianity repudiating nature could not Christianize it; possessing all truth, it could not seek truth. Hence the world, professing to be Christian, went on its way from Paul to the author of the *Imitation* and from him to Pascal: "The chief malady of man is his restless curiosity concerning things which he cannot know. . . . His whole duty is to love God and hate himself." But man desires to know and cannot live without a measure of self-esteem. The pure doctrine of Paul is a way of life that can be practised only by men fleeing from an immediate wrath to come; the Christian repudiation of the intellect forced all historic churches, from the mediæval Papacy to the Southern Fundamentalists of our day, to persecute the seeker of new truth. But the Church of Paul, living in a world whose natural passions it could not touch, has had to compromise with that world at every

step, protecting the rich against the poor, praying for the victory of its bread-givers in every war, falling so low as to identify with its catholicity the pagan impulses of the patriot and the warrior.

There is a third way of life, that of the Jew. I deliberately disregard for the moment its great written foundations, the Torah and the Prophets, since these books have been constantly misread and misinterpreted in the light of their fictitious connexion with historical Christianity. I leave aside the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, which also belong to a strictly Jewish tradition, and have been even more violently wrenched from their historic context. I turn to the oral tradition which, though not recorded in writing until the early centuries of the present era, embodies an ethos that was fully developed at the time of the Babylonian captivity and is still expressed in the pious or instinctive practice of many thousands of human lives.

This Jewish way of life neither accepts nor repudiates without discrimination the natural man and his world. To it both are materials of which a new life is to be wrought. This sanctified human life is to be lived within the law, but not indiscriminately or regarding the dead letter. "The Sabbath is given to you; but you, you are not given to the Sabbath." This attitude, wrongly held to be a Christian contribution, is further elaborated and universalized: "Of such importance is the duty to respect man, one's fellow-being, that it is permitted to transgress precepts explicitly announced in the holy law, if these are at variance with that duty." The Jewish way of life seeks flexibly and sanely to sanctify the natural world within which it exists and which it accepts. Its emphasis is not on kind, but on quality of action. It knows human life to be what it is. "If one were to kill the passions the world would perish." It goes soberly into detail. Among good things are "beauty, strength, wealth, honour, wisdom, old age, white hair, and sons." Among things "which are good when used in moderation and harmful when abused are wine,

work, sleep, wealth, travel, sexual love." The Jewish teaching has nothing to say of faith, but much of wisdom. But it demands that wisdom issue in action. In a thousand forms and on a thousand occasions it reiterates the principle: "Woe unto the disciples of the law who possess wisdom and do not practise virtue." And what is virtue? "Filial piety, charity, hospitality, the establishment of peace among men." Peace—the four Hebrew letters that symbolize that word are sprinkled up and down these pages. "The blessing of God is peace." But this peace is not a metaphysical peace of grace wrought by a miracle. It must be achieved within the actual world by love. "The day of Atonement expiates your offences against God; it does not expiate an offence against a fellow-man unless you have reconciled him to you." . . . "Benevolence and love are worth as much as the observation of all the other precepts of the divine law." . . . "Lovingkindness is worth more than all sacrifices." A thousand precepts, examples, and legends drive home the same point. With infinite spiritual delicacy the duty toward one's fellow-man is defined. One's beneficence shall not hurt his pride nor one's kindness be emphatic. For the aim of one's life is to bring peace and to diminish the suffering that is under the sun. A *Mischna* of the tractate *Sanhedrin*, of great antiquity to judge by its legendary naïveté, symbolizes the whole matter: "God feels pain each time that a man suffers. When the blood of a man is spilt, be it even of an impious man, God groans and shows upon his head or arms the very wounds by which one of his children was wounded." And all our actions are to be done, according to the sayings of the fathers, "for the sake of God," for the sake of this wounded God. . . . The Western World has tried the pagan acceptance of man and nature; it has tried the Christian repudiation of man and nature; there is a third way—the sanctification, the humanization of the natural. That way has been tried by only one people.

III

Crisis

1

MOTIVE AND APOLOGY

We are at one of the three or four turning-points in the long history of Israel. This year is a year of decision; this year is being written, in blood and tears, in terror and confusion, the epilogue to a secular mistake and sin. It was not wholly our mistake and our sin; it was committed by us and the nations among whom we lived together; it was at certain periods committed by both them and by us in sincerity of heart and in the genuine hope of better things. The warnings against this error and this sin, which belongs wholly to the period of the civic emancipation of Jewry, the warnings and the doubts uttered since the days of Pinsker, were unheeded or even unheard of in the west of Europe and in America, because the west, pardonably enough, held that these warnings applied wholly to civilizations on a low level, and that the steady progress in a rigid direction of human affairs rendered them superfluous.

Surely and inevitably the day has at last come when it is clear that this expectation of a certain kind of progress in an unswerving direction was a delusion not only, not chiefly, as a matter of fact, but as a matter of possibility. We must go back to the moment of the emancipation; we must rebuild from that moment on. For the tragedy of the liberalistic tradition and hope was not that they were too liberal, as many reactionaries now assert, but that they were not liberal enough. Liberalism compromised on the shame of toleration at the price of self-destruction. It never offered freedom, which has no meaning except that of being what one was eternally meant to be; it never offered equality, for it asked as the price of a limited parcel of

civic rights the obliteration of the soul of the Jewish people. It was a hollow compromise; it has crumbled to the dust and the dust is soaked in the anguished sweat of our crucifixion.

Jews have good hearts. Nor is that goodness of heart wholly induced by sympathetic fears. A very ancient *Gemara* of *Taanith* is symbolical of a permanent attitude: "When the community is in grief none dare say: I will go home and eat and drink and peace be upon thee, my soul. . . . Rather must each man share in the grief of the community, even as did Moshe, our master. . . . He who shares in the grief of the community is destined to behold its consolation." Thus there can be no doubt of the deep sincerity of the horror that has shaken the Jewish world to its depth at the persecution in Germany. Poor as the world is in this year, Jews are giving; harrowed as the world is by other miseries, Jews are putting aside these other miseries which they share with all men to devote heart and strength to the succour of their people.

It is not enough. It is fatally not enough. All these horrors and all these sacrifices will have been in vain, as vain as war, as profitless as a foul disease, as futile and inexpiable at once as murder, unless Jews do more than grieve and give, unless they do more than pray and help, unless they use their minds, unless, putting aside for once and at last all emotional defences and all wish-fulfilments, they coldly and sternly think out and think through this latest of the persecutions of Israel and see it in its true character as differing fundamentally from all previous persecutions and thus marking the beginning of a new period in history in which Israel will be more deeply menaced than by the hordes of either Godfrey of Bouillon or of Petlura. Can Israel be saved? Israel cannot only be saved; it can be reborn out of this death; it can re-arise out of this apparent defeat with new health for itself and as a bringer of new health to the peoples. But only if no Jew any more says: "I have given my dollar. Nothing else

concerns me. The Rumanians and Poles are barbarians. I have given my dollar and signed a protest. I am safe. The Germans have gone raving mad."

We shall continue to pass judgments of moral value on the peoples who persecute us. It is our right, and millions of Gentiles, to whom it is a duty, will join us in passing these judgments. But neither our judgments of moral value nor theirs will avail. Psycho-biological forces slowly and silently at work during an hundred years have burst and blazed into sudden and overwhelming catastrophe. These forces exist. You cannot eliminate them by calling them evil. They are evil. But they are also beyond good and evil. Technical guilt, active on the part of the nations in demanding of us an impossible price for civic equality (which on these terms was not equality at all!), passive guilt on our part in accepting and trying to live up to this tragic bargain—this guilt exists. Like all guilt it has issued in disaster. But what is needed today, if we are to be saved at all, is not grief over our guilt or indignation over that of others. Insight into the so-ness of things alone can save us. The intellectual conscience of Jews must be aroused. They must be *driven* to rethink the problem of their character and fate. Such is the motive of this discussion.

Does it require an apology? It should require none. But conditions exist which make it inevitable, which force me and others like me into questioning ourselves and questioning our right to speak and asking if this duty which we so deeply feel is not almost an impertinence. In his usual telling and sagacious way Maurice Samuel not long ago analyzed this condition that makes him and me and other Jews so hesitant and makes us feel as though we were psychically in thongs and fetters in our work: there is a community of four and a half million Jews in America without a folk-life. Its bindings are sociological, not spiritual. We speak and there is no resonance; we plead and there is no echo. (In good times they buy more copies of our books, in bad times fewer. That has no

relevance. I am speaking on another plane. I am thinking of Jewish villages in Poland where an emissary is sent to the market town to buy one copy of a new book by Shalom Asch for the whole village. That copy is then taken to pieces and the sheets are passed around. Shalom Asch is a poor man, too. But he need not feel that he is not heard. They criticize him; they nag him; they say he has never equalled his earlier tales. But he is their writer and they are his people and he need not be ashamed or afraid to speak.)

Yet though there is little or no resonance when we speak and little echo when we plead, we must speak and plead because the creation of a folk-life amid the Jews of America and the turning of a sociological community into a spiritually homogeneous people is the only hope—the only and single hope—not only for the Jews of America, but for all Israel. Hence we must strive somehow first to create that by our speaking and pleading which we need in order to speak and to plead freely at all. We must overcome our hesitations and our dismay and our sense of thrusting ourselves forward in order in our humble measure and with our humble means to serve Israel. And this we must do, since to serve Israel, even if it reject us, even if we are constantly misinterpreted (as I shall be in this matter and upon this very point), *that* is the content and meaning of our lives. And now an hour and a day have come which are crucial. We are *b'emek he-charutz*, in the Valley of Decision. We shall hear and heed the voice from Zion that Joel heard and proclaimed or we shall perish.

2

Let us try the simplest approach to the inextricable coil of problems, arising from subtlest mental confusions and spiritual diseases. Wherever three or four Jews gather in the world, they will sooner or later talk about the Jewish problem; they will discuss their situation in the country

in which they are or the status of the Jews in other countries; they will say, unless persecution is very active in their dwelling-place, that conditions are not bad and are likely to improve more and more and that the persecutors in other lands are evidently on a lower civilizatory plane than the people among whom they live. I have heard exactly this talk in Youngstown, Ohio, and in Marienbad in Czechoslovakia and in Constantine in the African mountains. Or else there will be, except in hours of extreme danger and woe for some part of the people, the talk of those who are trying to detach themselves from Israel. For they do not *live* their detachment, the vast majority of them, but talk about it. And finally there is the lowest stratum on which people tell Jewish jokes, jokes at the expense of their people, the psychical purpose of which is (among other things) to differentiate the teller of the anecdote from the subject of it and thus to establish a detachment on the part of the teller of the tale from those vices and foibles which Gentiles attribute to Jews and which the anecdotes commonly illustrate.

Everywhere and every day this interminable futile talk goes on and on. It has an hundred variations, subtler and coarser, but it can always be reduced to the several kinds noted above and it always consists psychologically of an intricate system of subconscious *suppresio veri* and *suggestio falsi* by means of which millions and millions of *Galuth* Jews try to keep themselves from facing the harsh but possibly healing weather of reality. They will not even objectify and so seek to interpret the continuousness and intensity of their preoccupation with themselves and their people and its fate. For did they do so they would be forced at once to seek to make this preoccupation a rational one by giving it the food of both reflection and knowledge. But they will practise the most agonized gestures of defence against this process, since to yield to it would destroy a thousand easy habits, shatter a thousand

false conventions, and force upon them a reorganization of their whole lives.

They are not particularly to be blamed. All human beings use the same system of psychical defence against some problem that is too difficult to meet, some truth that seems to them too brutal to face. But the difference between Gentiles and Jews in respect of the practice of these psychological defences is this, that for Gentiles it may mean an impairment of intellectual integrity or of social functioning or of efficiency, but for Jews it has become a matter of life and death for each one and for our whole people. A matter of life and death. For the same sparks from which burst forth this year the foul and fatal German conflagration are smouldering, however hid in ashes, however swept out of sight by sincere Gentile goodwill and by unacknowledged Jewish terror, in every land of the Dispersion. In every one. In *every* one. There is still time to stamp them out. But it is the eleventh hour. And the stamping out of them cannot be accomplished at a smaller expense than that of the spiritual reorganization of millions of Jewish lives and the consequent reorganization, both spiritual and sociological, of the *Galuth* communities.

(Practical suggestions? I am coming to them by and by. Have patience with me. Note first: I am advising no stampede to Palestine, which is physically impossible, for one thing, and would be futile, since it would destroy the *Yishuv* that we have. I am aware of the fact that the great majority of the Jewish people will have to continue in the Dispersion. They will have to save themselves and help to save their Gentile fellow-men where they are. Therefore the task of the age, which is the task of saving the people, is twofold: (1) the rapid strengthening and up-building of the *Yishuv*; (2) the reorganization, both spiritual and sociological, of the communities of the Dispersion.)

Now it is evident that we cannot reorganize the com-

munities unless the people who constitute them will inwardly consent to the reorganization, will have reached an insight so deep that it issues in necessary action. If the majority says: "We can still get by in the old discredited ways; never mind what befalls our children or grandchildren," then, of course, there is no hope. Hence millions of Jews must be converted, must achieve a *teshuvah*, each for himself, in order to consent to the saving of their people, in order to consent to the reconstruction of the Jewish communities of the world. Nothing less than a conversion, nothing less than a profound inner change, nothing less than a broken and a contrite Jewish heart, and yet a heart proud in its brokenness and its contrition will avail. On April 1, 1933, on the day of the boycott in Germany, the *Jüdische Rundschau* of Berlin, that high-minded and intrepid paper, which has been as a beacon and a light in the German darkness, carried the headline: "*Tragt ihn mit Stolz, den gelben Fleck*" (Wear the yellow badge with pride"). We must do that everywhere and always. We must do more than that. The yellow badge must sink from the garment upon which hostile hands have sewn it into the heart; it must become one with the heart and fill it wholly, so wholly, so utterly, that none knows the difference between the yellow badge and his own heart.

We are far from that self-affirmation. We are so far from it that we must begin at the humble level of trying to make people see how futile and foolish is preoccupation without reflection and knowledge. Here you are, we must say to these millions of Jews, poor and rich, learned and simple, and every day, impelled thereto by what you unescapably are, you talk about Jewish affairs and the Jewish problem (never dreaming that you, you in your tepidness and ignorance and lack of strong self-affirmation according to knowledge and feeling, constitute the deepest Jewish problem), and you talk of the Jewish people and grieve over its griefs and triumph in its few triumphs, and

how many Jewish books are in your houses, and how many purely Jewish acts do you perform, and how saturated are you with the flowering into legend and ritual and poetry and philosophy of the instincts and the being of our people? Your contribution is defensive talk, and meanwhile your souls harden or wither and with it the soul of the people, and so you rob the people as a whole, of which you are a member and which in your hidden and obscure way you love, of all pride and erectness and power of reaction and defence, and deliver it up, bound and gagged and blindfolded, to the implacable forces of the world. And you will not permit yourselves to know that these forces are implacable, not because men are equally stupid and brutal and maddened everywhere, but because the present post-emancipatory structure of Jewish life and the consequent confrontation Gentile-Jew are built upon a theory that is false and has been proven false—false and hollow to the very crumbling and corrupted core of it, the theory, namely, that Jews can cease to be Jews in order to buy their way into Gentile civilization, or that the masters of the Gentile civilizations will admit that the price of the de-Judaization of the Jews has ever been wholly paid. (I explained all this in *Israel* eight years ago, and two years later Arnold Zweig explained it with a depth and precision still unrivalled in *Caliban, oder Politik und Leidenschaft*. And our books, instead of becoming instruments toward the auto-emancipation of Jewry and the warding off of catastrophe, were patronized by a few high-brows whose “ifs” and “buts” were stamped out in the year 1933 in blood and dirt.)

It is well to be pessimistic today in order to be able to be a little optimistic on some future day. It is, of course, not to be thought of that the Jewries of German speech will be able to continue that creative and scholarly leadership which they have held from Zunz to Martin Buber and his disciples and from Herzl on to the Zionist thinkers

of yesterday. The Polish communities, though less catastrophically stricken, are so oppressed and burdened that leadership cannot be expected from them. The Russian Jews are lost to us in this generation by the device of Red assimilation, quite analogous to Prussian assimilation and mass-baptism during certain decades of the nineteenth century, or to the processes of any polity which, in the period of consolidation, is willing temporarily to admit that assimilation can proceed to the point of paying. Hence the leadership of world-Jewry outside of Palestine devolves upon American Jewry, and American Jewry, the most populous and powerful in the world today, is also the most ignorant and the one in which the crippling sickness of preoccupation without knowledge is most prevalent. It is not only prevalent; it is deep-seated, so that Maurice Samuel was able to point to the consistent Jewish ignorance of even the majority of the editors of the *Menorah Journal*, so that one of the most distinguished of contemporary Jewish thinkers, returning from America, asked me with stony despair: "Do even Jews turn stupid in America?" "No, not stupid, but stubbornly ignorant, building up all sorts of defences against that immersion in Jewish knowledge which alone can give them the inner force with which to resist the world on decent terms and bear with human dignity their inevitable Jewish fate." And upon this Jewry history places today the burden and responsibility of leadership.

It is a necessity and a duty to be brutal today. It is necessary to be brutal even at the risk of being misunderstood. For, given the precise circumstances that confront us from now on, the *Jewish* ignorance of American Jewry may prove a disaster of incalculable consequences to all Israel. And I do not exaggerate. A simple sum in arithmetic will prove that. There are, let us say, four and a half million Jews in the United States. That must mean three-quarters of a million men and women of mature years and even today economically self-sustaining after some fash-

ion. But deduct half a million as either wholly illiterate or completely down and out. (An absurd and grossly exaggerated deduction.) That leaves a quarter of a million still. Now if *one* in every *five* of this residual two hundred and fifty thousand were willing to invest twenty-five cents a month in Jewish knowledge and reflection and in Jewish news, *Opinion*¹ would have a monthly circulation of fifty thousand, would it not? Not this magazine that the editors are able to offer now, but an infinitely richer, fuller, deeper magazine, carrying a wealth of Jewish knowledge into a barren, into an unsaved world.

Am I pleading *pro domo*? I am. But the *domus*, the "house" that I am pleading for is none other than *khol beth Yisrael*, the whole house of Israel, which stands in need of salvation *b'chayeykhon u-b'yomikhon*, within your lifetime and within your days, *ba'agala u-biseman kariv*, now and in briefest time! Do you ever *read* even the *Kaddish* or do you just mouth and mumble it? You are Jews. Nothing will save you anywhere in the world from bearing the Jewish fate that is yours. Wherewith will you bear it and help others to bear it, how will you affirm it and consent to it and even rejoice in it, if Israel and its life and its history and its meaning and its speech and its *ethos* are not alive and eloquent in your hearts and *minds*?

IV

To Youth

The flight toward Communism, quite irrespective of the merits of the case, is very often today only the last attempt of flight from Judaism and Jewish self-affirmation. "Red assimilation" they called it in Berlin and Munich even in strictly non-Zionist circles and even before the Hitler terror. And now those poor young Red assimilation-

¹ The periodical in which this paper first appeared.

ists are in concentration camps, more brutally starved and beaten than their Gentile comrades, who are not at all happy over the Jewish aspects of the party. Nor is that all. The Red assimilationism of the sons and daughters of the Jewish bourgeoisie was one of the few not wholly false and lying reproaches that the Nazis could bring against German Jewry. For do you suppose that the historic civilizations of Western Europe and America will not fight their overthrow by Communism to the last ditch? You can die for Communism as your ancestors died in the Persian armies that Chosroes led against Byzantium; you can die for Communism as your grandfathers died for German unity and later for German imperialism. The weaker or rebellious or expansive rather than conservative forces of every age are always willing to let you form part of their spear-heads and storm divisions. There is no new element in that Communist tolerance which is the lure toward Red assimilationism. There is never anything new in Jewish history from the point of view of the Gentiles. Never. The new thing is auto-emancipation. The new thing in this age is living and dying as Jews and for the Jewish people. As assimilationists of *any* kind you do but repeat the sterile tragic gesture of the ages.

What then are you to do? How are you to find those "assets" of Judaism? There is no short or easy way. There is no way that has to do with the silly ephemeral catch-words of an age. There is an eternal human process which our sages have called *teshuvah*, a turning or returning; it is the same psychological phenomenon which Christianity has explained as the action of grace, as conversion. All the leaders of the modern Jewish movement who were born in assimilationist families and environment have had to undergo that *teshuvah*, that conversion or return and for the young Jews of America there is no new, there is no other way. All the great phenomena of human life are eternal and recurrent. You cannot save your Jewish soul by intellectual gadgets invented yesterday. Neither can

you do it by a busy and impatient use of the mere intelligence. You must descend into the depth of your own being in stillness. When you are perfectly still and perfectly passive and have excluded all the troubling and distracting noises of the world and all its strivings and preoccupations, you will find that the core of your being is Jewish, that your soul is the soul of a Jew, freighted with half-conscious racial and historic memories, reacting in the very deeps of it in a manner which has not changed through the revolving ages and therefore allied forevermore with the deeps of the Jewish soul everywhere and always. And recognizing that in yourself you will find that you will hear the call of the other Jewish selves in the world, both vertically throughout history and horizontally through all the lands of earth. And from that call to you will arise a spirit of humility and of love. For you, too, desire, although you may not know it, to burst the bonds of merely selfish living within the frozen chambers of the heart; you, too, desire to die in order truly to live; you, too, desire to serve and to love; and, descending to the very depths and sources of your being you will see that it is inhuman and impossible to love an abstract humanity and to love without relation or discrimination, and you will find that *your* way of loving mankind is to love the Jewish people and your way of serving mankind is to serve Israel.

Nor will you then fear any more that this love for your people has in it any shadow of hostility to other peoples or has any relation—as assimilationists and ashamed Jews feign—with anything that has to do with the chauvinism or belligerent exclusiveness of the other nations. For by this time you will have been led—as I was led—to read the classics and the records of our people and the sayings of our saints and sages with eyes no more blinded by the hostile glare of the world or with the shifty looks of one in flight from his home and people, and you will see that the pacifist and spiritual nationalism and self-

integration which we achieved in the age of the prophets and of which the promise and adumbration are to be discerned in the records of that more barbarous age which we shared with all the families of mankind, has not only never been lost, but has been continually reborn in all the luminous minds and characters of the exile from Jehuda Halevi to Martin Buber.

And coming thus into the true vision of our history and achieving an exact definition of the function we have exercised and the part that we have played, the ceremonies of house and Synagogue, far from being a "morgue of dead beliefs," will rise for you into a fiery life and overwhelming reality. Were you present at a *Seder* celebration during *Pesach* of the April of 1933, when that foul and poisonous storm was rising against our brethren in Germany? And did you hear those words of the *Hagada*: "From age to age it is the duty of each of us to consider himself as though he himself had come up out of Egypt (*B'khol dor va-dor chayab adam lir'oth eth-atzmo kh'ilu hu yatza mi'mitzrayim*)!" Did you hear the cry and thunder and also the lofty resignation of those words? "A morgue of dead beliefs?" There is no festival or memorial of our ancestral religion which, historically and psychologically interpreted, if you will, does not beat upon the heart with its terrible reality. Why should we not mourn on the ninth of *Ab* over the destruction of the symbol of our nationhood from which these millennial sufferings and tragedies have sprung? Why should we not rejoice on *Simchat Torah*, seeing that it is demonstrably the ineluctable habit of the individual Jewish soul and of the soul of all Israel to take upon itself a law, an ethical command, a way of life of its own choosing, and by the witness of ourselves and of all the world different in some essence, however subtle, from the laws and ways of life chosen by the other peoples?

In every age the lost Jews return to Judaism. It is what you, too, young American Jews, are wanting and yearn-

ing to do. That inner yearning is the source of your being troubled and of your very irritations and resistances. You are burning to take upon yourself the yoke of your own law; you are unhappy because you have not yet succeeded, in however modern a sense, in finding the Jewish way and taking upon yourselves the law and love of a wholly Jewish life. Go where Chasidim, clad in white, each clasping his *Sefer Torah*, dance on *Erev Simchat Torah*. Get a little *shikker*. It is with joy that we are to be Jews. . . .

SHALOM SPIEGEL

One of the weightiest as well as most effective of the younger scholars and thinkers, Dr. Shalom Spiegel, was born in a then Austrian province of post-war Rumania in 1899. He studied at the Israelitische Lehranstalt and at the University of Vienna (Ph.D., 1922). He was one of the founders and early leaders of the Jewish youth movement of the Young Watchman (*Ha'shomer Ha'Tsair*) group and edited its central organ in Vienna. From 1922 to 1928 he lived and taught in Palestine, whence he was called to the chair of Hebrew Language and Literature at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, which he almost at once rendered distinguished by the lectures that were published two years later under the title of *Hebrew Reborn*. From this book the following extract is taken. Since then Dr. Spiegel has published: *Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel, A Prophetic Attestation of the Decalogue*, and *Midrash hanirdafim besifrutenu*. The living character of Dr. Spiegel's interpretative scholarship may be illustrated by the following passage from the first chapter of *Hebrew Reborn*: "The power of a language can scarcely be gauged. Language is more than language. Within language lie concealed magic forces of nature and of blood, lees of instinct and culture, a heritage of emotions, habits of thought traditions of taste, inheritances of will—the imperative of the past. It is impossible to measure the power and influence of all this upon the soul, upon its consciousness and upon its subterranean strata."

SHALOM SPIEGEL

The Curse of a Lie

Its literary shortcomings notwithstanding, the German movement for enlightenment is an incisive event in Jewish history. Its example led East European Jewry off the straight path for a long while. It bequeathed to later generations the embarrassing question of the Jew in Western civilization. An unheroic generation offered to the problems of a great epoch a warped answer which placed the Jew in a fatally false position among the other peoples. Which in turn hindered the rest of the world from taking a normal attitude toward the Jew—effects that still continue down to our own day.

Up to the very threshold of modern times the Jew concerned himself little with the judgment of the alien world. The scorn of his enemy hurt, but it did not wound him; it could not degrade him in his own eyes. For it was God's inscrutable will that the redemption should be preceded by exile. Hence His people bore patiently and humbly the arrogance, the persecution, and the contempt of the unjust, trusting in His Name: for all shall pass, but Thou and Thy word shall not pass. The hatred of the world threatened the physical existence of the Jew, but it had no power to corrupt his soul. Against the peril of corruption he was safeguarded by his trust in God. The love of the Jew for his God enabled him to see even in his enemy the instrument of the divine judgment, and compelled the impossible—love of one's enemy. Read the most humane and moving confession of a love of God that

is exalted to the extreme of loving one's enemy, written in the Middle Ages, during the Crusades (which cause one who knows Jewish history to turn away in horror) by one of the most authentic mouthpieces of Israel, Jehuda Halevi:

Since thou hast been the abode of love,
My loves have camped wherever Thou hast camped.
The reproaches of mine enemies have been pleasant to me
for Thy sake:

Leave them, let them afflict him whom Thou dost afflict.
My foes learned Thy wrath, and I loved them,
For they pursued the victim whom Thou didst smite.
From the day that Thou didst despise me, I despised myself,
For I shall not honour what Thou hast despised.
Until the indignation be overpast, and Thou send redemption,
To this, Thine inheritance that Thou didst once redeem.

The hatred of the world for the Jew thus becomes a part of the divine world-order, and can have no venomous influence upon his soul.

This reading into Jewish history of a divine plan, stubbornly adhered to despite all outward seeming of world and time—which refuted it every day—collapsed in the emancipation period. The alien enemy world presented, promised to present, as if by its own impulse, freedom and equality to the Jews, without merit or sacrifice on their part, without their having been historically prepared for a sudden grace of fate. Freedom was thrown to them as an unmerited favour, like alms. And alms shame the recipient.

The Jew's protective illusion against the contempt of the world was dissipated. The inimical outer world that they had hitherto banned, whose judgment had never mattered to them was now, for the first time in the history of the Diaspora, looked to with a sense of inferiority; in fact, its opinion, though as adverse as ever, despite all the watchwords of progress, became the criterion of the Jews for their own estimate of themselves. Only now did the Jews feel the whole tragic range of the problem—what

was the real reason why the Jews were always and everywhere hated and despised? Was it conceivable that in a two-thousand-years' struggle one side should show only cruelty, tyranny, and greed, and the other only suffering innocence? Why did so many otherwise noble and highly gifted nations pour out the vile, to quote Treitschke, the diabolic forces that slumbered in the depths of their souls upon the Jewish people in particular, and upon the Jewish people only? Was it thinkable that we should always have had the right on our side, and that the others trampled upon it?

That indeed is quite impossible. Once raised, the doubt gnawed ever more stubbornly: Why, then, was it so? Were we not hated because we did not want to surrender our separateness and to resolve ourselves into the community, with which at times we had been bound up through centuries of history? Because we alone refused to submit to the command of history—to give up our peculiar individuality, the surrender of which is the tragic and inescapable destiny of a nation without a home? Because we have woven ourselves into deceptive dreams, misled by vanished memories of former greatness and by fantastic hopes for our future; because we have lost all sense of present reality, its rights and its duties? Because we are Jews so much, and men so little?

A radical change had taken place in the psychology of the Jewish people; for, up to that time, only the enemy had spoken of it in such terms. Ever and again, during our millennial passage through the midst of the nations, charges had been raised against the "certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples, whose laws are diverse from those of every people"—thus not only in the Book of Esther. Juvenal brings the same accusation against the Roman Jews:

*Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius.*

This reproach, hitherto flung at us in manifold forms by the alien environment, was now raised by the Jew himself. Up to that time, humanity and Judaism had been identical in Jewish eyes—indeed, Jews had always believed that Judaism *was* noblest humanity; now, humanity was regarded as the antithesis of Judaism. For this generation, humanity was that other, alien world which the Jew had always denied. And Judaism was no longer divine preference for an ancient civilization, but the contemptuous judgment of the alien world, a shamed admission of inferiority, a badly veiled *mea culpa*, or—to quote the cynical genius of the time—"a misfortune." And the whole next century was to bleed over the tragic discord between the two concepts of *Jew* versus *Man*.

"Become a man!" was in fact adopted as the slogan of the Jewish enlightenment, which was put forward in numerous variations, whereof the best known is J. L. Gordon's "Be a Jew in your tent, and a man abroad." Logically, this should have meant, "Cease to be a Jew," since Judaism and humanity now stood to each other in inverse ratio. However, against this intellectual energy to think—let alone live—a problem through to its logical end, something in the Jewish soul protested: the still-not-uprooted national feeling, the unreasoned bond of blood and history, imponderabilia for which the age of enlightenment had little understanding, but which, nevertheless, were stronger than rationalism. The struggle between the two forces, between the intellect which commanded a break with "prejudice" and the feeling of blood-community which, though sneered at as a superstition, would not permit itself to be put down; between the idolatrous cult of the alien and the unextinguished covenant with Judaism; between the conscious striving toward assimilation and the unconscious loyalty to a fellowship of race and tradition—this is the content and the hallmark of that epoch.

The champions of the German *Haskalah* did not clearly recognize the contradiction implied in their slogan of

"Man-Jew." That whole generation lacked the capacity for historical thinking, as Mendelssohn once very honestly confessed. Overwhelmed and deluded by the cosmopolitan watchwords of those days, it sincerely believed that very soon the national differences would be resolved, just as distinctions of race and creed were about to disappear, and the nations would merge into the sea of All-Humanity. But the nations entertained no thought of such a *salto mortale* into the blue of the international heavens; and the Napoleonic wars were soon to cause nationalist distinctions to flare up violently, leaving to the Jews alone the fiction of a blank and featureless world-citizenship.

"Become a man!" is an abstraction and a residue of the mediæval vivification of concepts that exist in the intellect alone. Just as in the reality there is no such thing as fruit in general, but always certain specific varieties, such as the apple, pear and nut, so there is no such thing as man in general. When the enlightenment slogan of "Become a man!" had to be translated into concrete terms, it actually meant (as Achad Ha'Am pointed out) : Become a German, a Frenchman, an Englishman, etc. But how can one be a Jew and a German, a member of two peoples, a child, as it were, of two mothers?

A painful perplexity of ideas, emotions, conscience ensued. For fear of losing the emancipation it had won, that generation was deterred from declaring free and open allegiance to the Jewish people; while to declare itself unreservedly part of the people among whom it lived and to abandon Judaism altogether, the incomprehensible something within themselves would not permit.

So they saved themselves by a figment, an artifice. The changed status of the Jews within the State which was ushered in with the emancipation, the stripping of the Jewish community organization of all its autonomous and political privileges and of its representative national capacity, and its degradation to a mere synagogical body, gave the impetus to the unfortunate error (possible only

in an age so devoid of all historic understanding) that was to be the source of all later dishonesties and misunderstandings, and was to place the Jews in an exceedingly false position among the peoples for many a decade. I refer to the doctrine that the Jews are not a people, but a religious community. The Jew died in shame, and in his stead was born the German, Frenchman, Pole, etc., of the Mosaic persuasion.

But even this "persuasion" was incompatible with the spirit of the new age. The contemporary world of thought (Voltaire, Holbach, de la Mettrie, Diderot, Wolff, Lessing, Reimarius), with its one-sided cult of the intellect which attempted to prove everything rationalistically, with its sharp criticism of religious ideas which at times (as in France) went to the length of atheism and extreme materialism, was unfavourable toward religion in general, and so much more so toward the Jewish religion, which had become ossified during hundreds of years, having been severed from the natural soil of its fatherland. Even the moderate Mendelssohn, who was sincerely attached to Judaism, said in the spirit of his time (in his chief philosophical work, *Jerusalem*): "I recognize no eternal verities except those which cannot only be made comprehensible through the human intellect, but can also be demonstrated and confirmed by human forces." He soon shielded himself, indeed, by saying that the "fear of God" has drawn a line between free investigation and that loyal obedience to the laws of God which it behooved no honest man to overstep. But that reservation was rejected by the radical youth as logically indefensible, and indulgently explained as a senile habit of clinging to old prejudices as people cling to beloved old furniture they cannot bear to part with. Youth always inclines to extremes, and how much more so the youth of a people of extremes. Just as formerly this people went to all lengths in its obstinate conservatism, so now it lost itself in revolutionary radicalism, up to the very point of self-dissolution.

After certain shy attempts, in the days of the Meassefim, at reforms which were concerned only with peripheral trifles, they went on to subject to the criticism of the intellect the very core and soul of the Jewish religion, the cause of its survival—Messianism.

The faith in Messianism had been unshakable throughout the entire course of Jewish history: the more irrational it was, the more strongly it was believed. *Prorsus credible quia ineptum est*. But rationalism recognized only the present, and only that within the present which could be justified by the intellect. The “end of days” was consigned to the lumber-room together with historic memories. Equal rights for the Jews seemed to demand not only the surrender of the Jewish past, but their aspirations toward an independent future. The little Corsican and great realist, who had once dreamed of restoring Palestine for the Jews, soon changed his mind when he saw the Jews of his generation. “It would be a sign of impotence,” he declared, “if I were to drive out the Jews. I shall find ways of having them seek their Jerusalem in France.”

What the ghastliest torments had not been able to accomplish the petty fear of losing legal emancipation did. The eighteen centuries of passionate faith and heroic martyrdom in despite of a whole world were simply asserted to be a delusion—at best a mere poetic fancy, a metaphor which could be taken literally only by the ignorant, but which the Jew of the new age could easily explain in the spirit of rationalism and without forfeiting his new position in the State. Thus, in 1822 Lazarus Bendavid wrote in the *Zeitschrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums*: “No man will take it amiss if the Jew finds his Messiah in this, that the good princes have placed him on a level of equality with their other citizens, and graciously allowed him to hope that with complete fulfilment of the duties of the citizen, he would achieve all the rights of citizenship”—a servant-like obsequiousness—how un-

worthy of all the earlier generations of Messianic heroism, of sheer human nobility!

This servility of spirit and fearfulness of being thought disloyal led them to eradicate the name of Zion from the prayer-book, to eliminate Hebrew as the language of worship, and, in general, to blot out all traces of nationalism from the Jewish rites and festivals. All recollections of national glory were stricken from the memorial tablets of the people, all strivings for national redemption were denied. They reduced themselves to the rank of a religious sect and repudiated the peculiar character and content of that religion—all this for the sake of winning the confidence of the European world, of showing themselves worthy of emancipation.

But of course the Christian world became no more favourably disposed. The nobler elements were disgusted, while the others, though keeping the slogans of tolerance on their lips, were not so hasty as the Jews in breaking with the past and with all tradition, including their traditional attitude toward the Jews. Even a Goethe said, in a moment of outspokenness, "We tolerate no Jew among us. For how can we concede him participation in the highest culture when he denies its origin and derivation. . . ."

And for the sake of this culture the Jews gave up their all, broke with old, hallowed things. Yet even that did not suffice; there was still lacking complete dissolution, baptism. And Heine merely makes a bitter formulation of the postulate of the times: "The baptismal certificate is the admission ticket into European civilization."

Baptism spread like the plague. Much that was young and hungry for freedom turned its back on Judaism. That period cannot be understood if we charge it with treason or low opportunism, for it was not the worst, but, on the contrary, very often the best, elements who put it up to themselves as a duty to dare the leap out of the wearily outlived environment into the New World. The efforts to elevate Judaism according to the prescriptions of the Ber-

lin *Haskalah* and so win the respect of Europe very soon collapsed, and the uselessness of that method was recognized. Thus, for example, the tumultuous young spirits of the Verein fuer Kultur und Wissenschaft des Judentums soon gave up all hope, and made a shamed admission of the superiority of previous Jewish generations:

The enthusiasm for religion, the genuineness of the old relationships, have disappeared, but no new enthusiasm has burst forth, no new relationship has been built up. We have been left with the negative enlightenment which despised and disdained what had existed previously, but which did not trouble to give new content to its own empty abstractions. It is a state of complete dissolution [and therefore], it is not worth while to concern oneself about such a crew.

Very few indeed had the fine, sensitive, manly honour of Gabriel Riesser (1806-1863): "Honour demands that, even though inwardly you may be inclined toward the dominant church, you do not withdraw from your community until the goal is reached, until the Palladium of freedom is conquered for the Jew as well." But the mob of the baptized did not consider it a duty to remain loyally among their fellow-sufferers. They lost faith in their people, in the world, and in the "Palladium of freedom." Graetz may have erred in his statistics when he wrote that "within three decades half of the Berlin community went over to the Church," but the epidemic of desertion from the Jewish community was doubtless one of the largest of mass-baptisms.

But even baptism did not liberate that generation. Somewhere in the cellar of their conscience their sickly, timorous Judaism was lurking. Was it the voice of the blood, was it a gnawing consciousness of hypocrisy, of deceit? Hence their exaggerated zeal in exhibiting religious sentiments, the very thing that betrays the neophyte; hence the obtrusive displays of alien patriotisms, in their loud overemphasis disclosing the disingenuous convert. Hence in that whole generation the inner discord, distortion,

disease, the misery and farce of maladjustment; experienced painfully, ridiculed mercilessly, and mirrored most exactly by the unfortunate victim and most gifted mouth-piece of the age—that strange mixture of subtlety, dreaminess, passion, graciousness of feeling, splendour, emptiness of soul, and cynicism of conscience—in short, by Heinrich Heine. Listen, please, to this convert making merry over baptism:

“Do you believe that one’s inner nature can be wholly changed through baptism? I don’t believe it, and to me it is a melancholy as well as ridiculous sight when the old lice who date back to Egypt, to the Pharaonic plagues, suddenly persuade themselves that they are fleas, and begin to hop like Christians. . . .”

Hence in that era so many pathological types, so many shipwrecked lives at odds with themselves and out of tune with the whole world, embittered, eaten up with *Weltschmerz* or *Judengram*; so many natures, apparently profound and yet sick at soul, undermined with disbelief in their own selves, critical, disrespectful, denying all values, mistrusting everything because themselves living in dishonesty, and so becoming the playball of the most conflicting emotions. Hence the type of Jewish revolutionary so frequent in the nineteenth century who hated this world of deceit and hypocrisy and injustice, and in desperation flung himself into movements for upheaval which, perhaps, might change the intolerable order of things. Self-hatred looms here rather than a pious yearning for things to come.

This is the curse of the lie, that it always begets new lies and must always carry a new curse. Decades were to pass before a new generation would discover the fundamental dishonesty in the Jewish attitude caused by the epoch of the Jewish enlightenment, until the old, authentic forces in Judaism stirred once more. Moses Hess saw into it clearly: “So long as the Jew denies his nationality, because he has not the self-denial to admit his solidarity with an

unfortunate, persecuted, and despised people, his false attitude must become more intolerable with every passing day." By surrender of one's national dignity one gains the contempt rather than the esteem of the peoples.

This was not understood by the age of the German enlightenment, and thus Judaism was plunged into a profound crisis. It is unjust to make the German *Maskilim* responsible for the later unfortunate consequences, just as one may not make Mendelssohn responsible for the baptism of his children and the apostasy of that whole generation. They were a small generation, which did not realize the implications of their lukewarm compromises and half-measures. And Mendelssohn himself, correct but mediocre, was not adequate to the demands of a great era. How the generation of Lessing, Herder, Goethe, Humboldt, noble spirits sensitive to every authentic sign of creativeness, could have been enlightened on the Jewish problem and on the magnificent pathos of Jewish martyrdom, and how honest would have been their response! The epoch was far more suited to the purpose than many following, and that Jewish generation cannot be spared from such a reproach. Its false notion that open declaration of one's Jewishness conflicted with the duties of citizenship was not only an error, but cowardice, modern *Galuth* psychology. Until a generation born in freedom realized the unworthiness of this hypocritical attitude, and said: "If it be true that the emancipation of the Jews in exile is incompatible with Jewish nationality, then Jews ought to sacrifice emancipation to nationality." Thus Hess again, who, however, does not believe that such a dilemma exists.

How that whole Jewish century underestimated the Christian world one can realize with shame and grief when reading judgment on its attempts at national self-estrangement, rendered as early as 1836 by that great Christian scholar, Franz Delitzsch.

Last year the Jewish community of Rome laid a volume of Hebrew poems of praise at the feet of the "Holy Father." The poems were beautifully copied, and splendidly bound in white satin. They were held together by two locks of gold of artistic craftsmanship, and on each cover was the papal heraldic device embroidered in gold. The writing on the inside was different on every page, and was enclosed within pictures and drawings by the Venetian Christian artist, Paoletti, among which were the portraits of the Holy Father himself and also that of Solomon. The gift cost ten thousand francs. I see therein a symbol of the present situation of Jewish poetry: how, with or without conviction, it has become the bearer of fulsome praise to the Occident which in Rome devoutly kisses the slipper of the Pope, and in Germany the tiara of philosophy. The cowherd's tune of its homeland no longer awakens in it that home-sickness which erstwhile, in the Exile, was an inexhaustible fount of tears and songs. Poetry struggles, like its singers, after emancipation; and the emancipation of national poetry is its self-destruction. Mediæval Jewish poetry is the document of the freedom of the people in slavery; modern Jewish poetry that of the slavery of the people in freedom. May future Jewish poetry be the living portrayal of the people in freedom.

MAURICE SAMUEL

Probably the ablest Jewish intellectual of his generation in America, Maurice Samuel was born in Rumania in 1895. Taken to England in his early childhood, he was educated there, studying physics under Rutherford at Victoria University. He came to America in 1914, enlisted in the American army and saw service in France. He served on the Inter-Allied Reparations Committee and became active in the American Zionist movement, as he has been ever since. Beginning with 1928 he has divided his time between Palestine and America. Samuel is beyond any question and according to the most authentic fashion one of the best prose stylists now writing English. Since his most conspicuous books deal with Jewish subjects (*You Gentiles, I, The Jew, On the Rim of the Wilderness, Jews on Approval*) critics and anthologists of general literature have overlooked or "repressed" that fact. Middle-class American Jews who should be his audience and following, are still too given over to pussyfoot attitudes to relish his incorruptible intellect and dwell defensively on his occasional polemical indiscretions and his equally occasional inability to suffer fools gladly. It is also true that his most ambitious venture in fiction *Beyond Woman* (1934), is not an artistic success; it happens to be equally true that the American novelists capable of failing on such terms can be comfortably counted on the fingers of one hand. His magnificent essay in social psychology *King Mob* (1930), was, unhappily, not published over his own name, nor could the mob, national or international, be expected to enjoy this exact characterization of its nature and antics. A mind so scrupulous and uncompromising, in brief, meets with the dull resistance of a corrupt and muddle-headed world.

That this mind, being a Jewish mind, is completely identified with the Zionist movement, while the intellectually slack and hazy wabble between artiness and pseudo-Bolshevism is conformable to the better aspect of the nature of things.

MAURICE SAMUEL

I

Jewry and the World Mob

WHILE the physical economic world standardizes, setting harder and harder round the Jewish group, a new tone emerges, cutting across national and racial boundaries. It is the tone of the great anti-cultural epoch. The world mob is coming to birth. In the technique of life and thought the nations present an increasing likeness, but that likeness is not accompanied by an increasing friendliness. On the contrary, as the old, transmitted cultural memories are forgotten or submerged, a new irritation springs up between group and group. The nations are most strikingly alike in the character of the hatreds which separate them.

For these hatreds have now become the sole outlet for the expression of individuality, the sole assertion of distinctiveness in a world which has washed away all other distinctions in the flood of its standardized technology. Without an inward separateness of culture to absorb the impulses of self-expression, the nations become more extravert than ever. The old economic reasons for war remain; they are made more explosive by boredom, nervousness, and emptiness of inner life.

The nations are losing their character as moulds of cultures, and are taking on that of sociological and political units, held together by belly interests alone. It does not matter, in this connexion, whether a country is capitalist or Communist; as long as the culture declines, the domi-

nant spirit is, by compulsion, that of usefulness and vulgarity. The spiritual value is regarded as decadent, and what passes for spiritual value is a sort of "higher" utilitarianism. Shakespeare is justified because he teaches us how to write advertising copy, mathematics is good for engineering, and manners have their use in the smoothing out of business contacts. It is regarded as affectation or degeneracy to waste time and energy on what benefits nothing but the invisible spirit. A man should spend his leisure in consuming something which can be sold to him at a profit. In Russia the same indulgence is regarded as bourgeois and counter-revolutionary. "Inwardness," "privacy," "living for oneself" fade from the individual and from the group experience.

Two parallel movements may therefore be observed in the world of ideas. Information is spreading faster today than ever before, but it is an information of facts, and carries with it no spiritual transforming power; so that people know more, but do not thereby become finer. On the other hand, pure enjoyment of æsthetics is reduced to the lowest human denominator. An æsthetic enjoyment connected with the ancient discipline of a hereditary culture becomes rare. The reaction must be quick, simple, and primitive, calling for no special training or aptitude, no relationship to a body of national experience.

These things are new not in nature, but in scope. They have always been self-defeating. The easily obtained is easily despised. Jazz, radio, movies are in themselves essentially uninteresting. Hence we have a union of the most ingenious modern devices with the most ancient tricks. The universal boredom is a variety of mental impotence; it is countered by the use of mental aphrodisiacs, and there is something pitiful in the frantic hunt for the sensational in a world which, presumably, should be fascinating as simple fare.

Jewish life has not escaped this fate wholly. Jews contribute externally to the pandemonium; and internally

Jewish life threatens to become the replica of the world kaleidoscope. Irving Berlin, the one-finger Mozart of rag-time, Al Jolson, the *Falasha*, whose English renditions of "*A Brievaler der Mamen*" have melted the heart of America, Balaban and Katz of Chicago, who first introduced West Point into the theatre and placed elegance within the reach of all, are first-class instances of Jewish coöperation in the building of American civilization. Anne Nichols is not ours, but we did our best with *The Jazz Singer*. Let us not forget the founders of the Book-of-the-Month Club, the initiators of an era of independent thinking and reading, and Haldeman-Julius, who has spread culture wider and thinner than any man before. Last and best, let us remember Lewis Browne, the Elinor Glyn of religion.

Concerning the inner changes in Jewish life I have used the phrases "identity without individuality" and "uncreative gregariousness." The chapters on the rabbinate, the effects of philanthropy, the English-Jewish press, and the fragments under the title, "Cantor, Let's Go!" will have indicated my full meaning. Yet to the extent that the above phrases are merely passive, they are inaccurate. It might appear that nothing but a name divides Jewish from non-Jewish life; actually, however, the negative or passive fact that there is no difference becomes a positive or active principle of evil when the dissolution of identity is impossible.

For the Jews are faced with something much worse than mere assimilation or race death. They are moving, precisely at a time when their lot threatens to become harder than ever before, toward the mass imbecility which characterizes the world spirit of our time. Judaism begins to take its tone from the nickel-in-the-slot epoch of human spiritual history. If the process continues the so-called Jewish group will be distinguished by nothing except its perpetual complaints.

These complaints will be all the more wearisome to all

parties when accompanied, as they are bound to be, by iterations of what the Jews "once did" for humanity. Pride in the past is at all times unreasonable; its one justification is that it can serve as a spur to the future. Without that justification it becomes the lowest form of usury. A pedlar of socks or bonds reminding the world that he is a descendant of the Maccabees, a priest-rabbi boasting that he is blood brother to Maimonides, merely adds to his other defects those of the parasite. He cannot pension himself on great contemporaries like Einstein and Freud, much less then on the almost forgotten past.

The darker shadow on the picture of tomorrow, almost obliterating the cruelty of the economic struggle, will be that new factor in Jewish life—emptiness; out of that emptiness there will spring, paradoxically, unavoidable evils. For a group that is held together by nothing but external pressure, having no cohesive principle of its own, becomes permeated by impotent resentments and mutual disgusts. Flung together in an economic struggle, with no vital illusion of an ideal to help them transcend the purely physical, Jews will regard one another as the authors of their misery: "If there were fewer Jews, we could get along better!" A bitterness without an outlet and without relief, a desire to run but no refuge to run to, a hatred of the blind, mad destiny which placed this senseless burden upon them, will fill their lives. Without an explanation for themselves or for their children, without the consolation of an inviolable personality, they will torment themselves and the rest of the world with perpetual protests. A secret loathing of themselves and envy of everyone not born a Jew will eat them within. The beginnings of that self-contempt, that self-loathing, and that envy are already to be noted in modern Jews.

Losing their sense of historical continuity, their national memory, they will be unable to understand how their position developed. They will appear in their own eyes as the victims of some stupid malevolence in the scheme of

things. Like the children of assimilating Jews who come home crying, "But we *aren't* Jews, are we?" they will cry out to the Gentiles: "But we are just the same kind of persons as you! Come into our temples, our meetings, our festivities; you will not know that you are among Jews. . . ." As their forbears in the Middle Ages threw the door open during the Passover ceremonies, that the Christian might come in and see that no ritual blood was being used, so the Jews of the future will throw open their homes to the rest of the world, inviting inspection, imploring it to believe that they have nothing to hide, no secret character, no mysterious entity. It will not avail them. The tremendous mediæval vision of an accursed race will at last have become a reality.

The self-hatred of the Jews has been made the subject of an interesting work by the German Jew, Theodor Lessing, who traces the beginnings of this pathological condition to the earliest literature of the people. In his opinion the unique spirit of self-criticism which appears in our folk-loristic books—a spirit without parallel in the records of any other people—is related to the latest agonies of individual Jews attempting to escape their racial cultural heritage. But he does not distinguish between the self-criticism of a people with high ideals from which they defected regularly, and the bitter self-corrosion of individuals who are not conscious of any ideals for which to suffer and to which to return. The old Jew said that we suffered because we were in exile and in an abnormal condition. Ours is the fault because we still are not perfect enough to bring about the return. This kind of self-accusation is creative. But the modern Jew has nothing to suffer for except the doubtful privilege of the doubtful claim that he is descended from Abe the Mesopotamian. And in his opinion the real source of his suffering is the fact that we are genuinely loathsome.

How Jews can hate Jews for being Jews is illustrated

by the difference of tone in the internal economic struggle. In the Middle Ages it was possible for one group of Jews to fail another group in the hour of need, or to exploit its weakness. But the sin was not attended by an emotion of contempt and loathing. In those days no secret and impotent longing to assimilate was blocked by the presence of large numbers of Jews which had to remain identifiable for the purposes of the economic struggle. Individual Jews, having defected to Christianity, might aid the persecutors; there was no group assault on the value of Jewishness as such. Hans F. R. Gunther, in his *Rassenkunde des Jüdischen Volkes*, quotes an extraordinary article which appeared in the publication of the National German Jews. The article deals with the Jews who tried to flee into Germany from the pogroms of countries to the east:

"These people are quite right from their own point of view when they try to shake the dust of pogrom countries from their shoes and flee to the milder west. The locusts are also right from their own point of view when they descend in swarms on our fields. But the man who is defending his own land, which gives him his bread and his well-being, is also in the right. And who can deny that they come in swarms? They laugh at rents, they laugh at officials. . . . Above all, they laugh at the wishes of the tenants. They have only one purpose in view, and they use every opportunity to further it. But they are far from making houses the sole object of their rapacity. Whatever money can buy is, in their eyes, a proper object for their greed."

"Nobody knows how many Jews from Eastern Europe there are in Germany. We only know that all statistics lie, public and private equally. The workers' relief committees of the Jews lie. The people of whom we speak do not go to these committees. The main stream comes to us out of German Austria. They come with unobjectionable passports, and are German citizens of the Jewish faith. Out of Tarnopol and surrounding districts they have conquered Vienna and are now conquering Berlin. When they have become masters of Berlin they will stretch out their strategic lines and conquer Paris.

The empty space created by the fall in the rate of exchange sucks them in."

The point I wish to make in quoting this passage has nothing to do with the reluctance of a given group of German Jews to help East European Jews escape from the hell of the Ukraine and Poland. It is the accompanying note of rage and contempt which occupies my attention. It is the wild exaggeration, born of a frantic loathing. The conquest of Vienna! The conquest of Paris and Berlin! By whom? By miserable and terrified Galician Jews! A cold and business-like repudiation of interest would have been comprehensible. But this passion of hatred corresponds to something more than a defence of one's economic interest; it springs from the inner self-disgust which is the companion of self-consciousness in the assimilating Jew. And as larger numbers of Jews turn toward assimilation as toward something both possible and desirable, the sources of such hatreds become more numerous and more potent.

It is against this intolerable prospect, against this immense boredom and self-weariness, that Jewish life must struggle on today. Carried along with the rest of the world in the stampede toward spiritual vacuity, it is threatened by an intenser tedium, a bleaker aridity, and a baser relationship among human beings. For the play of economic forces will hold together an empty structure of numbers, an agglomeration of units eager to fly apart and forever unable to do so. Like pebbles ground together by the clash of waters, the Jews will grate on one another, wear one another down. They will hear always the bleak, senseless noise of their own grinding contacts and will wonder how it was that the Jews did not commit suicide, individually, centuries and centuries ago. A double vain longing, for life or for death, will haunt them continuously, but they will be able to achieve neither.

Nothing less than this is, for the Jew, the statement of

his own problem. Not the approval of the world, nor the winning of political rights, nor even the avoidance of pogroms, touches the quick of the reality. And Jewish leadership which is afraid to speak out the whole truth will do little to help in the ordering of the forces which struggle against the death-in-life which threatens.

II

Lights in Darkness

Every so often a rabbi will preach a sermon, a publicist write an article, entitled, "Why I am a Jew"—an abstract defence of a choice that was never made. It is a pity that Jews cannot reconcile themselves to the simple truth: they are Jews because they were born Jews, and they remain Jews because in the mass they can become nothing else. That is to say, they are born into a certain group, trained in a certain consciousness, and kept there by the force of circumstances.

The whole of this book is dedicated to the proposition that Jews must make a virtue of necessity; and if this sounds like a dissatisfied admission, the tenor of my arguments has been misunderstood. Whatever beauty or dignity there is in life is born of a necessity transformed into a virtue. We are born by a necessity outside of ourselves, but, being born, nothing remains—nothing human and reasonable and livable—but to turn this compulsion to fine account by an affirmative attitude. We must work for bread, and we must repress many instincts lest the world tumble about our ears, which are circumstances not of our choosing. But since they are there they must be accepted as the framework of our creative will. Finally, we must die, and even this hateful necessity is transformed into good by proud acceptance and by contemplation of the relative immortality of our influence. So to live that we forget the compulsion, and come to derive joy from

living and from working, is the aim of all practical philosophy and ethics. "The pursuit of truth is a form of courage, and a philosopher may well love truth for its own sake, in that he is disposed to confront destiny, whatever it may be, with zest when possible, with resignation when necessary, and not seldom with amusement."—(Santayana.)

At least one question will linger in the reader's mind. Granting everything I have said concerning the pressure on us, knowing, too, as Professor Seligman has said (quoted by Heywood Broun in *Christians Only*), that "as Jews, Jewish students cannot get anywhere by being merely as good," what practical point is there in specifically Jewish knowledge, Jewish tradition? I have said that the superior equipment of the Jews in the world struggle has lost all potency; and it is idle to argue, as some Jews still do, that the substance of our ancient studies still makes for a valuable worldly training. It is true that many successful Jews will still be found, even in America, whose wits were sharpened in boyhood on the revolving problems of the Talmud. There are doctors, real estate dealers, merchants—I have met them in nearly every state—who attribute much of their success to the years they spent in the *Yeshivah*. They are undoubtedly right. The fact remains, however, that if they had given the same time and devotion to secular and utilitarian studies, they would have done even better. Much study of Jewish things is certainly better than little study of anything else; but an equal training in Talmud, on one hand, and in modern business methods and economics, on the other, leaves the former out of the field.

But the Jewish tradition of high intellectuality and discipline cannot be transmitted and made effective by argument, however cogent. No tradition is kept alive simply as a principle. It must live in the mind and imagination as a human experience, with a record of its own, with expressions in history, proverbs, stories, books, martyr-

doms. What I have set down coldly and weakly concerning the proper rôle of the intellectual principle, glows in the story of the Jewish people. There a sense of kinship with scholars and writers and students awakens an envy of their life, even with its pains and frustrations. Love of the mind is contagious. It cannot be imparted as a proposition in Euclid is imparted. Intellectual excitement can be inspired by example; it cannot be awakened by making out an abstract case for it.

A tradition to be kept alive must also reinterpret itself from age to age, so that its language does not grow obsolete. It is foolish to let the archaism of the form be the death of the content. There are modern Jews who turn from the wealth of the Jewish past because it was bound up with dogmatic religion; but then there are Communists who turn from Shakespeare because, as an artist, he was part of the English national spirit which was born with the English bourgeoisie. The modern intellectual is so afraid of eating something that isn't kosher that he restricts himself frequently to a diet of formulas.

The Jewish tradition has become, for Jews, a necessity of morale; its function is no longer (as it never consciously was) that of a direct preparation for the economic struggle, but that of a creative escape from an intolerable situation; more exactly, the conversion of an intolerable situation into the basis of a decent and creative life. To live together at all, Jews must live together in a tradition. A bleak community of gymnasiums, charity organizations, temples, poker clubs, and even economic interests has led to a bitterness of spirit which is not the less real because its psychological causes are only dimly understood.

But whether they are understood or not, these causes have touched off at a hundred points, even in this country, a revulsion of which I have become increasingly aware on periodic visits to the Jewish communities. "Weavers in secret," Bialik has called them, anonymous spirits, not leaders, who will not acquiesce in the conspiracy of vulgar

negation. They consider the records of the Jewish people, and apprehend the slow growth of its values; they see the complete structure of that long life, and note how the organism has adapted and readapted itself; and contemplating it as a continuity, and not as a jerky succession of unrelated generations, they feel themselves to be in the presence of a living thing which calls to them, draws them into itself, bidding them create again. They perceive that they can do better by themselves and by the rest of the world, by their own spirit and that of mankind (it is almost unnecessary for me to say, I think, that Jews with a strong Jewish culture are also the strongest in other cultures) if they associate themselves with this ancient and supple organism.

To such groups, small but obstinate, the Jewish tradition is not a piece of advice, for advice is cheap and can be had anywhere for the asking. It is not just an argument, accurate and sterile, but a fulness of life which, once accepted, needs no further justification.

To these groups, again, the enemies of Jewish life are those Jews who are devoid of the intellectual tradition and who are alienated from those human beings who, in the past, gave it substance through their efforts and hopes. The enemies are the theologians who would make of Judaism an excogitated system of ethics, the rabbis busy posing for the non-Jewish world, the soft-hearted, soft-headed parents who tremble for the minds of their children (forgetting how the Jewish mind flourished under severe discipline in the past, forgetting, too, that out of this discipline always came an enhanced capacity for the world's cultures), the leaders who represent us in every country as having been admitted on approval, and bid us guide ourselves by surrounding standards and methods, the Mosaic-Persuasionists who will not rest until we are distinguishable from the world by nothing but a lying name.

The human material of these obscure groups, sturdy, lovable, vital, is second to none that I have encountered in

the peoples I have lived among. But these groups are almost invariably distinguished by their recognition of Jewish tradition as a whole thing. To them Palestine has become a necessary projection of the will. As long as we waited for the Messiah to release our folk-will, Palestine could remain the symbol of a sentiment; but when we no longer believe in the Messiah, Palestine must become either a reality or a sentimentality. For Palestine cannot be torn out of the creative Jewish tradition without laying the structure in ruins. Whatever the obstacles, the building of a Jewish centre of civilization in the land which cradled the language and cultural personality of the people inheres in a Jewishness properly understood and properly lived. The meaning of Palestine to all Jewry—Palestine as a sociological fact, and Palestine as a new world—Weimar, according to the dreams of the Achad Ha'Amists—flows from this principle or else does not exist.

In this book I have stressed the economic motif in reaction against its too frequent elimination. Yet I do not believe that all human impulses come solely from the belly. The rigid materialists make, even from their own point of view, two errors: they do not make enough allowance for the time-lag between ideas and new economic set-ups, and they seem to assume that human groups react to their own economic needs with the accuracy of natural laws. Also, just as individuals become the victims of ideas which are not to their animal advantage, so entire groups will cling to hypnotic moralities and cultures which are physically costly and pointless. The economic "law," even as it operates in groups, compromises with other "laws"—the will to eat, be clothed, be sheltered, reproduce, compromises with other wills—the will to be interested and interesting, the will to applaud and be applauded, the will to be amused, the will not to be bored, the will to find intellectual fusion with the inscrutable universe, the will not to be alienated from sunsets, from intellectual delight, from the dead who begot us and the unborn we will beget.

And it is also true that the desire to coöperate with human beings is as continuous as instinctive rivalry, and the love of friendship as real as the love of domination and the necessities of exploitation. I have known instances which relate to the subject matter of this book; communities where the economic rivalry between Jews and non-Jews, either unperceived or over-ridden, has not interfered with a happy relationship; communities where, for instance, Jewish institutions draw more from the general chest than the Jews themselves contribute.

Acknowledging all this with a feeling of pride for the possibilities of the race, we must still bear in mind that these are only the indications of what may yet come to pass in the far-off future for the largest groups, and finally for humanity as a whole. When that time will come, perhaps a new shuffle will be needed in all human relationships, group and individual. But I am unable to conceive a humanity not organized for purposes of spiritual production, for the purpose of interest (as distinguished from interests) into groups with characters of their own.

The economic reality reinforces a psychologic necessity which will perhaps outlive it. My people is my instrument for coöperating with mankind, my channel to humanity. It organizes my affections and hatreds and brings them to effective focus. The ugliness I hate in Jewry is hateful everywhere, the good in it good for everyone. Love of humanity, when not implemented by the love of a people, is usually gushy and diffused sentimentalism. Depend upon it that the man who works for the world as a whole, not through the most immediate, most natural and most accessible passions, will forget the Eskimos one day, the Chinese the next.

Through ourselves we Jews, like every other people, can reach the world. But we must remember that the affirmative powers in us and their interplay with the world situation, call for the acceptance of a heavy discipline. Only the terrific illusion that we can be Jews on easy terms, that

we can take life as it comes, tacitly—as others do—can be fatal to us. In childhood and manhood we must carry the yoke which our forbears carried, and we must carry it gladly, because the only alternative is an intellectual and moral leprosy from which there is no escape unto death.

III

The Secret

The deepest change which is coming into Zionist life is actually only half conscious. And I take the liberty of using myself as an illustration of the spiritual experience of the average Zionist.

Ten or fifteen years ago I faced the Jewish problem in a simpler, starker, and bleaker way than I face it now. Fifteen years ago I would have said there are two aspects and two possibilities in Jewish life—the best, the solely creative in the midst of the Jewish people we will pour into Palestine; we will empty the Golus, we will make it dull and unbearable from the Jewish point of view as it is from the human point of view, and having distilled or focussed the best that there is in the Jews in Palestine we will say to the rest, “Die if you like.”

We had the point of view, a great many of us unconsciously, and I consciously, that those who want to assimilate may stay in the Golus. And we looked upon their assimilation as a calamity of very small importance in comparison with the possible calamity of the complete destruction of Judaism. More than that, we even looked at these actively and deliberately assimilating Jews, and with a certain degree, let us confess it, of hostility and even of venom, said, “You Bulls of Bashan, you who are comfortable and happy in the midst of the Golus, assimilate. We are going to Palestine to reconstitute the eternal legend of the Jew.”

Now I consciously, and many of us half consciously, have

realized that this philosophy is impossible. The 15,000,000 Jews of the world will never assimilate. They cannot be made to disappear. They cannot be made to lose the painful side of their identity. They can at best or at worst be made to lose only the affirmative side of their identity.

And perhaps the most startling as well as the most agonizing feature of the German Jewish tragedy has been the complete and blinding illumination of this point. For, actually, what is it that is involved in the practical, physical, political, economic action which we have undertaken on behalf of German Jews? After all, there are only 600,000 German Jews, a tenth as many as there were in Imperial Russia, a sixth as many as there are today in Poland, a seventh or an eighth as many as there are today in America.

Why, then, have we made this extraordinary fuss over 600,000 Jews? The reason lies actually in an ancient *Midrash* with which most of you are familiar. For it is said that Pharaoh, when he was persecuting the Jews, pleaded divine sanction. He said, "Did not God Himself say that the Jews abandoned Him, denied Him, flouted Him?" And the answer of God was, "That may be true, but it is none of your business; that business lies between Me and the Jews."

And though the Jews of Germany have denied, abandoned, and flouted Judaism, that is our business, and not the business of the Nazis. Our reply is, and this is the reply which is implicit in the practical action taken on behalf of the Jews of Germany. "You Germans expected that these 600,000 Jews would be *Hefkar*. You thought that these 600,000 could be made the butt and the focus of your rage, of your psychological diseases. You thought that there was no one in the world to claim them. The answer is, we claim them. They are ours."

And in effect, by so claiming German Jewry, we reclaim ourselves, inasmuch as we assert that no Jew, as long as he bears even the accusation of Jewishness, is alien to us. And it follows from this interpretation of our action toward

German Jewry that we bring to these half-alienated but certainly not disclaimed Jews, we bring to them something infinitely more important than merely physical or political assistance. We bring to them something which they are not yet able to understand, something which as a matter of fact a great many of us do not understand. We bring to them enormous values, which in their general and vast outline have been presented by Mr. Lewisohn, which I shall attempt to reinterpret in simpler, more everyday, and immediate terminology.

We bring to them the consciousness not only of 15,000,000 Jews asserting kinship and affection. We bring to them something to which they must struggle with infinite effort, with infinite anguish, namely, a 4,000-year established Jewish continuity. We shall make them aware, and by that process also make ourselves more acutely aware, of a backing not only in space, but in time.

There are countless Jews even in our midst who have taken up, under the impact of a momentary exciting and hysterical propaganda, the methods by which all our enemies have perished. We find these Jews not only in the Diaspora; we find them in Palestine also; we find them in the Zionist movement also. And when we Jews speak and we Zionists speak of the stigmata of the Golus, let us not be abstract. What are the stigmata of the Golus? What do we mean by saying that the Golus has exercised upon us an almost fatal influence in the imposition of alien corruptive ideas?

Briefly, let me say this: that just as in the economic field we have become diseased, economically diseased, by virtue of external imposition, so in many respects we have become spiritually diseased by a sort of willing acceptance of corruption. And when Jews flourish the sword, I can only say that there is a parallel between this attempt to accept an alien and impossible philosophy, a parallel between that and the somewhat less unavoidable evils inflicted upon us as a result of economic oppression. In brief,

the "*Yidlich mit the faredlich*" are only the "*Yidlich mit the shteklich*" in disguise.

When we speak of bringing to the Jews of Germany, or to the fourteen, fifteen, and perhaps twenty million it will be, in spite of an immense growth in Palestine, the twenty million Jews of the *Galuth*—when we speak of bringing to them the consolation, the strength, and the wholesomeness of a complete Jewish life, as we must, let us give ourselves an account of what we mean by this. And let us, first of all, recognize that the old partial and impossible philosophy of a divided Judaism, of a Zionism and a *Galuth*, of a resplendent Jewish homeland and a corrupt, decaying, and disappearing *Galuth* has become impossible. Let us actually think of what we mean to actually give to these people, and what it is that we as Zionists, not simply as Jews but as Jews with that vital consciousness which has issued in Zionism, what we intend to bring to them.

We cannot bring to them salvation by political tricks. Those who believe that the salvation of the Jewish people lies in a series of ever-increasing and ever more exciting political stunts deny essentially the character of Jewish life. We have not survived by that method. The method has been infinitely more laborious. And to a Zionist audience surely I may say that you must not be blinded and you must not be made drunk even by the wildest possibilities of success with regard to Palestine. For if ten years from now Palestine had two million Jews, fourteen, fifteen million will still languish in the Exile; what will the two million Jews of Palestine give them? And, important from the point of view of the practical and daily work of Zionists, what will the Zionists be doing as intermediaries between a built-up Palestine and desperate Golus?

We cannot come to the Jews of America or of any other section of world Jewry only with frantic political outbursts of enthusiasm. Those are relatively easy; in fact, they are so easy that there is no people in the world so stupid that it has not practised them with success. We must bring them

a great deal more than that. We must bring to them a laborious and painful philosophy of Jewish, what Ludwig Lewisohn has called, integration.

I know it will sound extremely tame and placid and commonplace, but there is no avoiding it. We must bring to them by our example a daily and hourly reconstitution of intimacy with Jewish values.

Those Jewish values are contained in what might be called the ethical legends of the people. The immense, the indescribable power of the Jewish legend is attested not only by the superficial acceptance which has been accorded to it during two thousand years by the Western World; it is attested even more by the convulsive struggles which an immoral nation is making to free itself from them. The fact that Germany must reject the Bible to become brutal is the first great modern testimony of the significance of an ethical influence upon the world.

The majority, I say, remain innocent of any intimate and immediate contact with these ethical, spiritual, and intellectual values. The Western World cannot even today, with the best or the worst will in the world, free itself from the illustrative force of these legendary creations. And even a George Bernard Shaw, if he turns to a new mythology of a new age, must use Adam and Eve as the stepping-stone. And if the world speaks of the liberation of a people it must return to the immortal, to the eternal symbol of the exodus from Egypt. And if the world turns, as it will some day, to that type of immortality which is insured by an intellectual insistence, it will have to come to that enormous and widespread legend of the Jewish mind which is symbolized in the thought represented by Yochanaan Ben Zakkai.

We today, who come to millions of Jews to bring them consolation and strength, to tell them that in the teeth of the rankest and foulest brutality there is still the possibility of a decent and lovely life, cannot impose upon them the swindle of a few borrowed slogans from modern political

life. That would be the lowest and the cheapest form of treachery ever perpetrated upon the Jews. If we bring them this consolation, we must bring them the fulness, the accumulated power, the accumulated fruitfulness, of all these thousands of years of experience.

These we cannot transmit to them simply in resolutions, nor can we transmit these to them in a few spectacular efforts to impress the outside world. Those have their use, and I do not deny the significance of those actions which figure in the daily commerce and commune of nations one between the other. But our impenetrable and incommunicable secret cannot be transmitted at a convention by a resolution, by a stunt, by a conference; it must be made throughout many years, throughout many lifetimes in a laborious, painful, and loving method.

Without this we become, in spite of all political successes in Palestine or anywhere else, the victims not only of the world's brutality, but of our own vacuity. With it we continue the eternal creative people that we have been until now.

EDITORS OF THE "JEWISH REVIEW"

The *Jüdische Rundschau* (*Jewish Review*) of Berlin, a biweekly paper, marked the fortieth anniversary of its existence in June, 1935. During this entire period it supported the cause of Zionism and of the rebirth of the Jewish people with signal ability and on the highest intellectual and ethical plane. During the greater part of its existence its circulation was small and it was, of course, neglected by the vast majority of intensely assimilatory German Jewry. When the catastrophe of 1933 broke over the heads of the dazed and incredulous German assimilationists, thousands of these forlorn and bitter souls turned to the *Jüdische Rundschau*. In spite of deadly terror and ever deeper poverty, its circulation has doubled and trebled in the last two years. The Jews of Germany were fortunate in having this beacon-light to guide them in their darkest age.

This volume could have no more fitting ending and epilogue than the great editorial which the *Jüdische Rundschau* published three days after that April 1st, 1933, on which the Jews of Germany were publicly nailed to the cross for the sins of their fellow men. Nor does there exist anywhere another single sentence that so profoundly sums up the history of post-emancipatory Jewry as this sentence written on that day of tragedy and terror by the editors of the *Jüdische Rundschau*: "It is false to say that the Jews have betrayed Germany. If they have betrayed anyone or anything it is themselves and their Judaism that they have betrayed."

"JUEDISCHE RUNDSCHAU" OF BERLIN
ON APRIL 4TH, 1933

Wear It with Pride—the Yellow Badge!

THE 1st of April, 1933, will remain an important date not only in the history of German Jewry, but in that of the entire Jewish people. For the events of the boycott day have not only their political and economic, but their moral and spiritual, aspects. The daily press has discussed fully the political and economic questions; demagogic needs have in these matters darkened counsel. To discuss the moral issue is our task. For in spite of all current discussion of the Jewish problem, it is clear that none but ourselves can express what is passing today in the souls of German Jews and what observation is to be made from a Jewish point of view on the events that have come upon us. Jews cannot speak otherwise than *as Jews* today. All else is senseless. The phantasm of the so-called "Jewish press" has faded. The fatal error of many Jews that one can defend Jewish interests under an alien cloak is exploded. German Jewry received a lesson on the 1st of April that cuts far deeper than even its bitter and today triumphant enemies have knowledge of.

It has never been our fashion to lament. To react to happenings of such catastrophic force with sentimental babble we leave to the Jews of that generation which learned nothing and forgot everything. What is needed in the discussion of Jewish affairs is an entirely new tone. We live in a new time. A whole world of ideals and concepts has crashed to ruin. That may give pain to many.

But none will be able to sustain himself from now on who shirks realities. We are in the midst of a complete transformation of the intellectual and political, the social and the economic, life. Our gravest concern is this: How does Jewry react?

The 1st of April, 1933, can be a day of Jewish awakening and Jewish rebirth. If the Jews will it so! If the Jews have the inner maturity and magnanimity. If the Jews are *not* as their enemies represent them.

Embattled Jewry must affirm itself.

Even on this day of tragic agitation when the unparalleled spectacle of the universal ostracizing of the entire Jewry of a great civilized country shook and rent our hearts, we must nevertheless seek to preserve our power of steady reflection. Difficult as it is even to grasp the events of these days, yet we dare not despair and must give an accounting to our own souls without self-deception. What one would wish is that the pamphlet which marked the birth of Zionism, Theodor Herzl's *The Jewish State*, might today be disseminated in hundreds of thousands of copies among Jews and non-Jews alike. If any sense were left for the recognition of magnanimity, of knightliness and justice, any National-Socialist who read this essay would be horror-stricken at his own blind fury. But every Jew, too, who reads it would begin to understand and to derive from it both consolation and strength.

Theodor Herzl, whose pure name has been sullied during these days in all Germany by a *forged quotation*, wrote in the introduction to his treatise: "The Jewish question exists. It would be folly to deny it. And it is a survival of the Middle Ages which even today and despite their best efforts the civilized peoples have not been able to solve. For they showed a definite magnanimity when they emancipated us. Nevertheless, the Jewish question exists wherever Jews live in noticeable numbers. . . . I believe that I understand anti-Semitism in spite of the complicatedness of the phenomenon. I regard it as a Jew but without hate

or fear. I can discern in it the elements of brutal comedy, of vulgar economic envy, of inherited prejudice, of religious intolerance, but also the element of supposed self-defence. I consider the Jewish question neither a social nor a religious question, often as it may appear in these guises. It is a national question. In order to solve it we must transform it into a political world problem to be regulated in the councils of the civilized peoples."

Of this treatise, published in 1897, page after page should be transcribed here in order to show that Theodor Herzl was the first Jew sufficiently ingenuous to regard anti-Semitism in connexion with the Jewish problem. And he recognized the fact that no ostrich policy, but only a frank discussion of the facts in the full light of day, could ever lead to better things. He was more passionately opposed to no single thing than to that of which he is falsely accused today, namely the formation of a non-public Jewish world league or any Jewish action that might lead the people to suspect such a league. In his essay *Leroy-Beaulieu and Anti-Semitism* he wrote: "We Zionists are most emphatically opposed to the type of Jewish interaction which, if effective, might seem to become a state within the state, but which, in view of its necessary futility, would produce nothing but ill. . . . Let me say that for the solution of the Jewish problem the crying need is an international discussion: *not* secret societies nor hushed intervention nor back-stairs politics, but the frankest debating of the question under the full and constant control of public opinion."

We Jews who have been trained in the spirit of Herzl would even on this day rather understand than accuse. And we would ask of ourselves what *our* guilt has been and wherein *we* have failed. For always on critical and tragic days has the Jewish people been wont to ask that question first. Does not our chief prayer contain the words, "On account of our sins were we driven forth from our

land"? Only if we are sufficiently self-critical will we be able to do justice to others.

The guilt of Jewry, the heavy guilt, is this: that it turned a deaf ear to the call of Theodor Herzl and even jeered thereat. The Jews did not want to admit the existence of a Jewish question. They thought that what mattered was not to be known to be a Jew. We are accused today of having betrayed the German people; the National-Socialist press brands us, who are powerless to defend ourselves, as "enemies of the nation." *It is false that the Jews have betrayed Germany. If they have betrayed anyone or anything, it is themselves and their Judaism that they have betrayed.*

Because the Jew did not proudly and openly represent his Jewishness, because he attempted to "get out from under" the Jewish problem, *therefore* he shares the guilt of today's humiliation of our people.

In the midst of all the bitterness that fills us at the reading of the National-Socialist calls to boycott our people and at the false accusations contained therein, for one regulation we are not ungrateful to the boycott committee which states in Paragraph 3: "It goes without saying that we mean business concerns owned by members of the Jewish race. We are not concerned with religion. Jews who have submitted to Catholic or Protestant baptism or have seceded from their religious community remain Jews within the meaning of this order."

That is a sound reminder to all *our* traitors. He who slinks away from his community in order to improve his personal position shall not earn the reward of his treason. In this attitude toward our renegades there may be the faint beginning of a clarification. The Jew who denies his Judaism is no better a citizen than he who affirms it uprightly. To be a renegade is shameful enough. So long as the world seemed to reward this shame, it seemed profitable. The profit is swept away. The Jew is rendered recognizable as such. He wears the yellow badge.

That the boycott committee ordered shields "showing on a black background a yellow spot to be attached to the shops in question," is a terrific symbol. For this shield was supposed to brand us and to render us contemptible in men's eyes. Very well. *We accept the shield and shall make of it a badge of honour.*

Many Jews underwent last Saturday a gruelling experience. Not for an inner conviction, not for loyalty to their people, not for their pride in a magnificent history and in noblest human achievement were they suddenly forced to admit their Jewishness, but by the affixing of a red placard or a yellow badge. The troopers went from house to house, sticking their placards to doors and windows and painting the window-panes. For four-and-twenty hours the whole of German Jewry stood, so to speak, in the pillory. In addition to other signs and inscriptions the troopers frequently painted upon windows the *Magen David*. They meant to dishonour us. *Jews, take it upon yourselves, that shield of David and honour it anew.*

For—at this point begins our duty of self-recollection—if this escutcheon is defiled today, think not that our enemies alone have done it. How many Jews were there not among us who could not seem to get their fill of undignified self-irony. Judaism was held to be a thing outdated; it was regarded without seriousness; men and women sought to flee from its tragic implications by a grin. But let it not be forgotten that today and for long there has existed a new type, that free and proud Jew, whom the non-Jewish world does not yet know. . . .

Less than thirty years ago it was considered scandalous even to mention the Jewish problem among educated people. The Zionists were regarded as disturbers of the peace haunted by a mania. Today the Jewish problem is such a burning one that every child, every schoolboy, every simple man in the street is ceaselessly preoccupied with it. On April the 1st every Jew in Germany was stamped as such. According to the latest regulations of the boycott

committee it has been determined that, in case of renewal, only two uniform signs are to be employed: "German house" and "Jew." The Jew is known. Evasion or hiding is at an end. The Jewish answer must be clear. It must be that briefest of sentences that Moses spoke to the Egyptian: IVRI ANOCHI. I, a Jew. *We must affirm our Jewishness.* That is the moral meaning of this hour in history. The time is too agitated for argument. . . . But we, the Jewish people, can defend our honour by a moral act. We remember all those who in the course of five thousand years have been called Jews and have been stigmatised as Jews. The world reminds us that we are of them, that we are Jews. And we answer: Yes, it is our pride and glory that we are!

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



132 362

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY